

APR 4 1921

GENERAL LIBRARY

APR 4 1921

The Classical Journal

PUBLISHED BY THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE WEST AND SOUTH
WITH THE CO-OPERATION OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND
AND THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC STATES

Volume XVI

APRIL 1921

Number 7

Editorial	385
The Project Method in Beginning Latin	Wren Jones Grinstead 388
Plautus Up-to-Date	Mrs. Samuel Valentine Cole 399
Our Ancestry Linguistic	J. E. Hollingsworth 410
Ad Alpes. I and II	H. C. Nutting 418
Training Soldiers for the Roman Legion	S. E. Stout 423
Notes	
Nepos and Roman Praise of Hannibal	Clyde R. Jeffords 433
The Test of the Patronymics	John A. Scott 433
Current Events	434
Hints for Teachers	440
Book Reviews	443
<i>Homeric Greek. A Book for Beginners</i> , Pharr (Robbins); <i>Q. Horati Flacci Carminum Librum Quintum</i> , Godley (Stout).	
Recent Books	448

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, LONDON
THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO
FUKUOKA, SENDAI
THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, SHANGHAI

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Published by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, with the co-operation
of the Classical Association of New England and the Classical Association
of the Pacific States

Managing Editors

FRANK J. MILLER
The University of Chicago

For New England
SIDNEY N. DEANE
Smith College

ARTHUR T. WALKER
The University of Kansas

For the Pacific States
HERBERT C. NUTTING
The University of California

Associate Editors

GEORGE H. CHASE
Harvard University

WALTER MILLER
The University of Missouri

CLARENCE W. GLEASON
Roxbury Latin School, Boston

DANIEL W. LOTHMAN
East High School, Cleveland

JULIANNE A. ROLLER
Franklin High School, Portland, Oregon

JOHN A. SCOTT
Northwestern University

GILBERT C. SCOGGIN
New York City

GEORGE HOWE
University of North Carolina

BERTHA GREEN
Hollywood High School, Los Angeles

BERTHOLD L. ULLMAN
University of Iowa

The Classical Journal is published monthly except in July, August, and September at the University of Chicago Press, 3750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. The subscription price is \$2.50 per year; the price of single copies is 30 cents. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Bolivia, Colombia, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Shanghai. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$2.65); on single copies 2 cents (total 32 cents). For all other countries in the Postal Union, 24 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$2.74); on single copies 3 cents (total 33 cents). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized to quote the prices indicated:

For the British Empire: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, 12s. 6d. each; single copies, including postage, 1s. 7d. each.

For Japan and Korea: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISEI, 11 to 16 Nihonbashi Tori Sanchome, Tokyo, Japan. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, Yen 5.50 each; single copies, including postage, Yen 0.66 each.

For China: THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, 13 North Szechuen Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions \$2.50; single copies 30 cents, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, if mailed direct outside of Shanghai, on yearly subscriptions 24 cents, on single copies 3 cents.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit. Deliveries are not guaranteed within the war zones of Europe nor in other countries where transportation is disturbed by conditions incident to war.

Business Correspondence should be addressed as follows:

1. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of the Middle West and South to ROLLIN H. TANNER, Denison University, Granville, Ohio. The territory of the Association includes Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

2. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of New England to JOHN S. GALERAITH, Williams-town, Mass. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

3. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of the Pacific States to JAMES T. ALLEN, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. The territory of this Association includes California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and Arizona. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

4. Concerning subscriptions (not related to membership) to THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts should be sent either to FRANK J. MILLER, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., or to ARTHUR T. WALKER, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.; from New England contributors to SIDNEY N. DEANE, Smith College, Northampton, Mass., and from the Pacific States to HERBERT C. NUTTING, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.

Fifty reprints of articles will be furnished gratis to authors. Additional copies, if ordered in advance of publication, will be supplied at cost.

Entered as second-class matter, May 16, 1906, at the Post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of July 16, 1894.
Acceptance for mailing at the special rate of Postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on August 12, 1918.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME XVI

APRIL 1921

NUMBER 7

Editorial

WANTED—A WORLD-LANGUAGE

Ever since the confusion of tongues at Babel, whenever (and if) that unhappy event took place, the numerous races of men have been badly handicapped in their intercourse with one another by their differences of language and their consequent inability to communicate freely with one another.

Never until comparatively recent times, however, has this need been so keenly felt as to urge a practical solution of the problem upon the nations. In the first stages of inter-tribal human intercourse, they had a universal means of communication, the sign language, which, indeed, is still in existence and in practical use; later, the more powerful and cultured nations, despising all "barbarian" tongues, either forced their own upon the nations who served them, or left them to gain knowledge of the ruling tongue as best they might. Against this background the latest attempt and announced intention of a modern nation to force its language upon the world is an interesting case in point.

But in our day, modern conditions have made acute the need of a universal language. All agree in this. The question is, what language? This question is ably discussed by Professor W. A. Oldfather in a paper published in the January number of the *Classical Journal*, in which he shows that we cannot expect any living language to be accepted by the world (we do not mean, of course, in any case for home use, but only for international communication), because of natural national jealousies. After

considering the claims of languages not now in living use, Professor Oldfather presents and argues the claims of Latin as this medium.

To this discussion the *Minneapolis Journal* makes an interesting contribution in favor of Greek as the international language. It says editorially in the issue of February 28:

Were one to judge from the fuss made from time to time, one would suppose there was real need of an international language. In the golden age of the English language the great queen addressed the ambassador at her court in Latin, and all diplomatic conversation and correspondence of Europe was in Latin. Erasmus, the great scholar and writer, who visited the court of Elizabeth's father, Henry VIII, wrote Latin works that produced an effect comparable to that produced by the writings of Voltaire two centuries later.

Much pains has been expended in fabricating artificial languages, such as Esperanto, to serve as the medium of communication. But such constructions have no chance of practical adoption nor could they answer as well as actual language, whether dead like Latin or living like English.

There is a language, however, which is gradually becoming again a living one and which as a world-language would be ideal. The Greek universities and Greek men of culture, including Venizelos himself, are engaged in an attempt to restore classical purity and perfection to modern Greek. It is said that the endeavor is by no means vain and that gradually the ancient model is being approached. We may yet have the speech of Pericles, the written language of Plato, employed in social intercourse and commercial transactions, in contracts, in courts of law, in houses of assembly.

There is no modern language to compare with the ancient Hellenic tongue. There never was a language its equal. As scholars have said, every other speech compared to the ancient Greek is stammering. Other tongues have their merits and defects, but the Greek has all the merits combined and none of the defects. It is the perfection of speech. As a language for affairs it is as direct as the English or Latin; as a language for philosophy it is as good as the German and for science is better; as the language of polite society it is as elegant as the French; and it is more melodious than the best Tuscan Italian. This is no eulogy (eulogy, by the way, is a Greek word) of our own, but a summation of the *dicta* of scholars.

The modern European languages are derivatives and amalgams. In fact, they are all degenerations of speech which in the last four centuries have been ennobled and enlarged by genius and under the inspiration of necessity. Even the German, which boasts of being *sui generis*, is so harsh and involved that it offends the ear and is a poor servant for affairs.

The modern tongues are wonders, the more so when one considers their vulgar sources. But if they are wonders, the classic Greek is a miracle. It is as lucid as light, simple but complex, subtle, flexible, musical, sonorous, sweet;

the ideal instrument for disputation, for oratory, for poetry, for politics and jurisprudence, for science and metaphysics, for frivolity, for ordinary things.

The Japanese, it is said, have considered adopting a European tongue, preferably English. The Chinese, so poor is their monosyllabic language, so essentially primitive, need for participation in modern culture another tongue. Were they to consult the ideal inducements, they would take the classic Greek. And so would world-diplomacy, world-science, and philosophy.

The proposal, of course, is impracticable. However, if modern Greece develops as she promises and if her language becomes, even more than is now the case, the language of trade and the mart throughout the Eastern Mediterranean, the old Greek will no longer be, like the old Latin or the Sanskrit, merely an erudite dead tongue. And its superiority is so great that who knows how far it will spread?

THE PROJECT METHOD IN BEGINNING LATIN¹

BY WREN JONES GRINSTEAD
Eastern Kentucky State Normal School

The educational press and platform in the past five years have abounded in discussions of what is variously called the project, the problem, or tautologically the problem-project. Originally developed under this name as a method of handling vocational and motor subjects, it early attracted the attention of scientific students of education; and numerous attempts have been made to interpret it in psychological terms, to determine its relation to the educational process as a whole, and to apply its principles in the teaching of subjects other than those in which it has developed. It is the purpose of this paper to see how far the project method is legitimately applicable to beginning Latin, and to sketch the leading types of project which are of use in teaching Latin in the ninth grade.

You are all no doubt familiar with the project as applied in such studies as manual training, agriculture, and home economics. Hence I shall omit illustration, and proceed to summarize from recent educational discussions² the principles governing the project. It is "a purposeful act on the part of the child"; "a problem the solution of which results in an object, knowledge," or experience "of such value to the worker as to make the labor seem worth while to him." It is a unitary act with a practical end. It utilizes previous knowledge, and itself results in an advance in the child's knowledge or skill. An important feature of this utilization of previous knowledge is that the formulation of the project in the

¹ An address delivered before the foreign language section of the Southwestern Ohio Teachers' Association at Cincinnati, October 29, 1920.

² Most of the citations here given are credited without further detailed notice to Kilpatrick, "The Problem-Project Attack in Organization, Subject-Matter, and Teaching," *Proceedings of the National Education Association*, 1918, pp. 528-31; or to Bramon, *The Project Method in Education*, Badger, 1919.

pupil's own mind is both imaginative and systematic, in that he conceives his end, assembles the resources with which that end is to be attained, and then works according to specifications. Finally; the product is subject to verification in an objective manner; in other words, it has a social as well as an individual value.

Not all of these features are to be found fully developed in every project, but these are the salient characteristics of it. I think I need not dilate to a body of modern teachers upon the value of such a point of view in education. Pestalozzi has not done his work in vain. If "the purposeful act is the typical unit of the worthy life"; if school life is life itself to the child and for his time, as well as preparation for the life after school; if even "the moral value of persistent attack upon a task in itself irksome" is dependent upon the consciousness of a worth-while achievement; then we must regard the project-attitude as a major essential of the educational process.

Some selection of the types of project is necessary before we can profitably discuss their application in Latin. These types, according to Kilpatrick, are four. (1) The *constructive* type, which aims to embody in outward form some projected idea, is scarcely applicable to Latin at all, but belongs rather in the motor subjects. There is a close psychological parallelism, however, between it and the most prominent type of project in beginning Latin, as I shall show. The other three types are applicable in varying degrees at various stages of Latin with a varying proportion of pupils. (2) The *puzzle* type aims to straighten out some intellectual difficulty. (3) The *aesthetic* type aims at the enjoyment of some worthy experience. (4) The *learning* type aims to acquire some item of knowledge or skill which the pupil values either for its own sake (a near approximation to the aesthetic type), or for its later use to some practical end valued by the pupil.

Now the bearing of these three types on Latin will be promptly recognized. As for the learning type, most pupils like to show their skill in inflection and translation; though, except for the limited few who are not the dominant factor in the smaller high schools, this pride of skill has little ulterior value, but is merely a transitory display of social vanity before the teacher and the class.

It is a fire, in which the iron of Latin attainment may be shaped indeed, but only while it is hot. Not so with the aesthetic and puzzle types. We may tentatively classify the translation of an isolated Latin sentence as a problem of the puzzle type (though with an important modification which I shall discuss later), while the translation of even the briefest paragraph of connected Latin superadds to this the aesthetic type of problem. The aesthetic project involves too much complication of psychological attitude for inclusion in the limits of this paper, and is moreover based on the technique of the interpretation of the single sentence. Hence I shall confine myself to the project as it relates to the sentence in beginning Latin.

Let us now notice a point much insisted upon in most discussions of the project: namely, that it results in a product which is social in its character, and which will be recognized by others with some degree of objectivity as having that character of unity and finality, of goodness in itself, that quality of "there-you-are-ness," which enables it to issue from the mint of the pupil's own constructive imagination and pass current in the marts of his world. Such a quality attaches clearly to the testing of seed corn or the making of a cherry pie; but it is not so easy to see how it attaches to many of the "stunts" required of the pupil in a beginning Latin class. Hence the question arises here, In just what sense is Latin essentially social?

The answer to this question is to be found in the nature of language as distinct from the state, the workshop, or the mart. Society is the unity of the more-than-one. The state is the unity of the plural; while the workshop or the market place is the unity of the *ego* with the potentially plural. In contrast to this, language is essentially the unity of the dual. All speech is the address of the *ego* to the *tu*; it involves two rôles, and two only—the speaker and the hearer. The multiplication of hearers into an audience, as in a class, may add interest and emotional exaltation, but it does not alter the structure of speech. The primary aim of the speaker is still to make himself understood; that of the hearer, to understand. Any other individual in society is appropriately termed the "third person," who, while he is often the topic of

discourse in the sentence, is not a factor in its structure, since he does not speak, and we are not aiming to make him understand. It follows that the project is impossible in Latin unless the pupil in trying to interpret a Latin sentence consciously pictures some other person as saying something which it is "up to him" to understand; or, in trying to frame a Latin sentence, consciously imagines some other person who must be made to understand what he is trying to say. We might indeed introduce to our first-year class at the outset two characters who are to be present at every recitation: *Romanus*, who understands no English, and *Barbarus*, who understands no Latin. The pupil is always to be interpreter between these two; and the social criterion of his success is whether or not they understand, and feel that the pupil's version is clear and free from disturbing awkwardness of expression.

It is this indispensable duality of language that differentiates the problem in beginning Latin from the purely intellectual or puzzle type of project. The pure puzzle is predominantly individual, and perhaps because of this fact it is apt to seem trivial. When we have solved a puzzle, we say: "I have it!" When we grasp the meaning of a speaker, we say: "I get you!" Now one of the chief reasons for the stiff and silly translations too often offered in our classes lies in the fact that the pupil does not visualize *Romanus* as the speaker of the Latin sentence, and then in turn make himself the utterer of the same thought to the English-speaking *Barbarus* in his own vernacular. Hence he is merely solving a puzzle, and his only criterion of success is the teacher's authority; whereas it should be found in the socialization of his own imagination. For the perennial query to the teacher, "Is this right?" the pupil should come to ask *Barbarus* (or *Romanus*, as the case may be), "Do you get me?" Ideally this calls for the direct method; but there are two insuperable obstacles to this in most schools: it requires more time than the majority of pupils will actually give to Latin; and few teachers have the necessary range and readiness of vocabulary. Some Latin conversation will help materially; connected discourse (of a very simple type at first) will help more; for the rest, if we never forget the social, dual, reciprocal nature of language, and constantly make the pupil himself

a responsible interpreter between Romanus and Barbarus, we set before him the direct social aim that is essential to project-work.

We establish then at the outset two major types of problem confronting the pupil as interpreter: the first, in which his task is to grasp the entire sentence in Latin and restate it in English for Barbarus; the second, in which his task is to take a sentence already framed in English (preferably by the pupil himself, or, failing that, by the author of his text) and make it clear to Romanus in Latin. In either case the crux of the problem lies in the fact that the feel of the sentence as it comes to or from Romanus is dependent on the inflectional signs. It follows that if the project method is applicable in Latin at all as a constant and major method, it must be applicable to inflection. If we cannot get the pupil to make the inflection of a Latin word a project of his own, which he attacks with the definite design of using it in bilingual interpretation, we might as well give up the project method in Latin once for all; admit that Latin offers little or no field for self-activity to the usual type of pupil; plead guilty to all the indictments against our subject as a mechanical one devoid of native interest and remote from reality; and abdicate in favor of the pig club.

I am not ready to abdicate. I believe that Latin is good and wholesome for the majority if not all of the pupils in the high school; that it offers for most of them as much field for the purposeful project as any other subject; and that the place of this project is appropriately to be found in inflection, which at first sight seems to be the most arbitrary, artificial, and mechanical of all the exercises used in the Latin class.

The inflection of a Latin word, e.g., *puella*, cannot become a social project so long as the pupil thinks of *puellās* merely as the "accusative plural of *puella*"; because this association is not apt to be felt as contributing directly to the pupil's social aim as interpreter between Romanus and Barbarus. Nor will he be much nearer to a purposeful project—perhaps farther away, indeed—if he thinks, "*puellās* means 'girls,'" as so many of our books have it; because there are dozens of inappropriate ways in which he may use the form "girls." The Latin form will function in its proper way in interpretation only if he thinks, on seeing or hearing it, "Some

one does something to the girls." Each case has its own prevailing skeleton sentence-meaning of this nature, which the teacher had better work out for himself. The following is only suggestive:

"A nominative is or does something."

"Some one does something to an accusative." (The accusative after a preposition will take care of itself.)

"Something happens to the advantage or disadvantage of a dative."

"Something comes from an ablative, or is done with an ablative, or happens in an ablative (or locative)." Probably it is well to add to the three original ablative uses a fourth: "Something is done by (*ab*) an ablative person."

"Hey, there, Mr. Vocative!"

Although the meaning of the genitive is easier to understand, it is more difficult to phrase a key-meaning for it, because it does not in itself directly require a verb to complete the sentence feeling. Often it seems best to put it with a governing noun and translate the two together: *libri puellae* = "the girl's books"; *pars puellarum* = "some of the girls," etc.

In oral declension, these skeleton sentences (substituting the English equivalent of the Latin word under declension for the name of the case in which it is put) should be given with the case-form; though for the sake of conciseness it may be omitted in written exercises, provided the teacher is satisfied from frequent oral drill that the pupil thinks it. Every possible variation should be introduced that will forestall mere memoriter recital of the paradigm. Thus the order of the cases should be varied, and the pupil should learn to expect at any point a call for a brief Latin sentence employing the form just given. When the immediate purpose of the inflection is the translation or framing of a specific Latin sentence, only the case and number specified should be called for. Declension for its own sake should never occur, nor should isolated phrases ("of the girls" etc.) ever be permitted, since they are so apt to be misleading that they defeat the very purpose of inflection.

There is another essential feature of the project which we have not yet discussed, but which must be constantly kept in mind if inflection is to be not a matter of rote memory, but a real project.

This is the requirement that the project shall systematically utilize previous knowledge. It is indispensable to the educational value of the constructive project that the pupil shall first clearly formulate his aim; that he shall so marshal his resources for solution as to mark out a clear and apt procedure; and that he shall then work according to the specifications which he himself has laid down, to reach a definite and verifiable result. Now I contend that inflection is closely akin to the constructive type of project, in that a Latin word is almost always inflected according to a conceptual method, and that the aim and the method of solution can be clearly and economically formulated preliminary to the actual inflection of the word.

I would teach this systematic habit of procedure by requiring every paradigm, whether oral or written, to have a heading, stating specifically what is proposed to be done, and utilizing the vocabulary information about the word for the purpose of finding the stem (as determining the declension or conjugation), which is then stated as the final item of the heading. The word must then be inflected in harmony with the stem as thus specified. The complete project inflection then of *puella*, for example, would differ from its mere memoriter inflection, first, in its conceptual heading, and second, in the attachment to each form of a skeleton sentence or phrase giving the key to the use of the form in a sentence. It would go somewhat as follows:

Heading: states problem, finds and states stem.	Declension of $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{puella} \quad \text{puella}/e \text{ F.} \\ = "girl": \text{ stem } \textit{puellā} \end{array} \right.$
Body of paradigm: gives solution according to specifications in heading.	n. sing. <i>puella</i> = "a girl" (is or does something); pl. <i>puellae</i> = "girls" (are or do something); etc., through all the cases.

Of course this is merely a suggested form, and is subject to infinite variation; whether because of the different structure of case, degree, mood, tense, participial, and periphrastic forms, or because of the varying methods of texts and teachers in the treatment of base or stem, of inflection vowel, of termination or grammar

sign, of degree suffixes, and of tense signs and auxiliaries. Hence I shall not attempt to show you in detail how I would handle the various types of paradigm. After all, the project-method is more a matter of educational principle than of schoolroom devices. After the principle is once mastered as a habit of thinking, so that the pupils frame to themselves vocabulary forms and stem clearly before trying to inflect, and after inflection immediately apply the form in its appropriate sentence context, the preliminary procedure may be condensed or left implicit.

I believe that the project point of view is not inconsistent with thorough and frequent drill, provided the drill be so conducted that the pupil at every moment sees in it a direct bearing upon his daily problem as interpreter between Romanus and Barbarus. In such drill it is economical to make the inflection of the word in its entirety the typical thing; since it is the keystone of an arch whose sides are the understanding and the utterance of Latin speech. There are however three other types of Latin project involved in interpretation in which inflection functions directly indeed, but incidentally only, as a detail in the solution of the specific interpretative problem confronting the pupil. Two of these are in translation, the third in composition.

In the interpretation of a Latin sentence the pupil is confronted with a problem in which the chain of association is the reverse of that ordinarily observed in formal inflection. That is, he is to recognize an oblique form, and to interpret it in terms of sentence structure. A very common blunder here—almost inevitable if the pupil is left to himself, and often encouraged unfortunately by the teacher—is to attack first the problem of word-meaning. This often gives a false clue, and consequently should be reserved until the pupil has identified and interpreted the form. Given for example the following sentence (from a story, "Julia and Her Dog Fido"): *Canem amat, et ille dominam suam amat.* On the principle of the systematic use of previous knowledge, the pupil should not first look for the general meaning of *canem*, which he may or may not know, but should notice and interpret the inflectional sign *m*, which he does know. His solution then is: "*Canem* is an accusative masculine or feminine singular, and suggests that

someone does something to *canem*, whoever that is." The next word solves the problem of what the person does to *canem*; the context will have settled the question who the person is that loves *canem*. This is the commonest type of interpretative project. Its nature as a problem is clear, its aim definite and functional if the interpretative function of the pupil is kept before his mind; and its realization brings the consciousness of success in that the sentence when completed is felt as making sense to Barbarus.

Another problem subsidiary to this occurs when the pupil does not know or cannot recall the meaning of *canem*. The mechanical trial-and-error procedure, to which the pupil is likely to resort in default of systematic training, is to look in the vocabulary for something approximating *canem*. Sometimes this brings results; very often it involves considerable outlay of time and energy with no adequate reward, but with much discouraging fatigue; occasionally it gives the most grotesque mistranslations—as when the present writer, while studying Vergil in the academy, translated, *Lacrimas dilectae pelle Creusae*: "You are weeping on the hide of your beloved Creusa!"

The remedy for this is again a resort to the project principle of the systematic application of previous knowledge. The pupil knows that every inflected word is given in the vocabulary under a standard finding-form, which I find it convenient to call the rubric form. He knows too that in nouns this rubric is the nominative singular; and that *canem*, being an accusative, will not be found in the vocabulary. His initial step then is to restore the rubric form, and he must not be encouraged to resort to the vocabulary until he knows exactly what to look for. Sometimes this will be a choice amongst two or three possible rubrics; but they must all be in mind as definite possibilities. In looking for *canem*, he will first see that it must be masculine or feminine, and of the third or (much less probably) fifth declension. In both these the probable nominative sign is *s*. He must consequently reconstruct the nominative as *canis* (or possibly *canēs*), and look for that. This procedure can be put in written form for inspection and criticism as follows:

Problem: To find *canem* in the vocabulary.

First step (analysis and classification): *cane/m* is ac. M-F sing.; stem *cani* (or *canē*).

Second step (making of rubric): *cani+s>canis* or *canēs*. (Stem *canē* would also give *canēs*).

Third step (application and verification): The word is found in the vocabulary and declined as shown above for *puella*, but only in the form specified in First Step. If the ac. sing. when made is identical with the form found, and makes the sense already determined upon for the sentence, the verification is complete.

The fourth type of Latin project is that of turning the English sentence into Latin. This is admittedly the most difficult and irksome of all tasks expected of the Latin pupil. I need not enter here into the psychology of it, to show why it must be so; I shall only suggest that the project-principle requires that the sentences used for this purpose should if possible be of the pupil's own framing, addressed directly to the imaginary Romanus of the classroom. They should also be of so simple a character that the pupil can himself determine, or can be shown by the class, whether they make sense in Latin or not; otherwise we shall not have a socially testable product.

In the composition project the pupil must keep constantly in mind that Romanus is going to infer his meaning primarily from the inflectional signs, and that these will have to be determined by sentence structure. His first step then is to break up the sentence into its elements, and to determine how each of them fits into the sentence. His next will be to specify the forms required by the constructions already indicated. Incidentally, it is well for him to number them in the appropriate Latin order, and attack them in that order when he comes to write the Latin. He now has a set of specifications as a basis on which to apply the inflection project in making his forms.

Taking an easy sentence as an example, the analysis will proceed as follows:

First step: The girl / is leading / the dog.

 subject verb object

Second step: n. sing. 3 sing. ac. sing.

Word order: 1 3 2

The pupil then proceeds to apply the inflection project to the three elements in the order of the Latin, adopting the first element without further ado, since it is clearly to be in the rubric form. He thinks:

ac. sing. of
canis, cani/s M-F
= dog *cani*

ac. sing. *cane/m* = "Someone does something to the dog."

Since this is clearly what the sentence states, he has attained verification. Applying the same method to the verb, he finishes with a Latin sentence in the Latin order, which will make the appropriate sense to Romanus. Of course where the words are familiar, or their declension obvious, there will be much short-circuiting of this process; but the pupil should be held always in readiness to prove that he has the correct forms in his Latin sentences, by resort to the composition project, followed by the inflection project if his analysis has been correct; and he should be encouraged to write every Latin sentence in this way until he acquires the idiomatic feeling for the language.

Now is not this worth striving for, to get our pupil, in everything he does, to have a definite aim of a social nature, to analyze and classify the problem, to specify the method appropriate to solution, to work according to specifications, and to verify results? And if, as we have shown, all these things can be done in Latin with entire fitness to the nature of the subject, have we not as good a right as any of the "practical" studies to claim that our pupils are engaged in intelligent self-activity of an educative nature, and not working blindly by a priori rules? Provided, of course, that we do it!

PLAUTUS UP-TO-DATE¹

BY MRS. SAMUEL VALENTINE COLE
Wheaton College, Norton, Massachusetts

From a critical, literary point of view, what I have to offer you this evening is, I hope, fact. But being fact in a realm of dramatic fancy I must put myself under the protection of Thalia of the comic mask. And so I may with Shakespeare "play the fool with the time and (let) the spirits of the wise (you) sit in the clouds and mock me." If Pollonius might say to Hamlet of the traveling players, who offered their repertory for his pleasure, that "Seneca could not be too heavy, nor Plautus too light," you will perhaps pardon me for trying to divert or bore you, for a half-hour, with so frivolous a subject as "Plautus Up-to-date, or an Ancient George M. Cohan."

Two hundred years before the Christian Era, an obscure poet, whose name is even now still a matter of dispute among scholars, busied himself with writing plays "to make a Roman holiday." In scantiness of reference to himself, in his plays, as well as of actual information which we possess about his life, he might be called the Shakespeare of Roman literature. Nor does the similarity cease there. "Plautus in his branch of literature is equivalent to Cicero or Virgil in theirs,"² or to Shakespeare in his; and however meager may be our knowledge of the life of the poet, the fact remains that the plays of Plautus, with those of Terence and the eleven comedies of Aristophanes, "have been, since the beginning of the Middle Ages, the sole representatives of ancient and the sole models of modern comedy."³

We realize with Brander Matthews⁴ that "the likeness of certain ancient manifestations of the drama to certain modern manifestations is as easy to exaggerate as it is impossible to deny, and that

¹ Read at the fifteenth annual meeting of the Classical Association of New England.

² Mackail, *Latin Literature*, p. 21.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 16 f.

⁴ *Study of the Drama*, p. 125.

there is no occasion to give undue weight to the suggestion that the lyrical burlesque of the Greeks reveals a certain similarity to the nondescript medley made familiar of late in America by Messrs. Weber and Fields. So, too, the comedies of Plautus show a certain likeness to the plays of the tenement-house life in New York put together by Mr. Edward Harrigan,¹ or to the comedies of bad manners of George M. Cohan. But it is not our purpose to trace such literary imitations as "Ralph Roister Doister" from the *Miles Gloriosus* of Plautus, or Molière's *L'Avare* from the *Aulularia*, which are clearly imitations, in Mr. Harrigan's or anyone else's comedies, even though they seem to reflect quite clearly Plautus' "pictures of low life in Rome, and are as broadly humorous and as fundamentally veracious as his."²

Our purpose is merely to demonstrate in one more field the unchangingness of human nature. Disregarding Barrett Wendell's sarcastic definition of the duty of the theater of today as that of "sending the suburbs home happy,"³ we may assert that what "playgoers as a body want now in the twentieth century is what they have always wanted and what they always will want, as Victor Hugo has told us—first of all, action; then the display of passion to excite their sympathy; and finally the depiction of human nature, to satisfy man's eternal curiosity about himself."⁴

And by nothing is human nature so unmistakably revealed as by laughter. "The emotional life of yesterday, today, and tomorrow can differ little fundamentally."⁴ What yesterday laughed at, today and tomorrow will laugh at. This paper presents to you merely some of the means which Plautus used to arouse the jaded spirits of his audience to mirth and side by side with them the reiteration of those same means in comedies of today.

The difficulties in presenting a comparison of this sort to any audience we recognize at the outset. For we know that the mirth of Plautus has not in most cases lightened, for the average college

¹ *Study of the Drama*, p. 102.

² Quoted by W. P. Eaton, *Plays and Players, Leaves from a Critic's Notebook*, p. 326.

³ Matthews, *op. cit.*, p. 302.

⁴ G. P. Baker, *Dramatic Technique*, p. 63.

student, the burden of Latin required for the A.B. degree. And, on the other hand, we realize that the disproportion between the professorial or instructorial salary and the high cost of living forbids the satisfying of even a high-brow curiosity about comedy at first hand, in even the last rows of the highest gallery of our play-houses today. So to us Pinero may be just as much a mere name as Plautus. However, fortunately for us, most playwrights now publish their plays. And we will endeavor to make our illustrations sufficiently clear to prove our point that Plautus is as up-to-date as Pinero is antique.

There are, of course, "certain essentials which all good plays, from Aeschylus to Lord Dunsany, share at least in part."¹ But it is not of those we are speaking. We plan rather to touch upon certain high lights, to borrow a figure from art criticism, which even a cursory reading of the plays of Plautus will show as likely to catch and hold the attention and interest of the audience of his day, and then to point out in some modern plays the use of those same details with the same intent.

Of these the first is trickery, or deception, which a careful study of the plays of Plautus has showed us to be the center of interest in nearly all the comedies.² In nineteen of the twenty-one extant plays of Plautus trickery of some kind is resorted to for various reasons, either intentionally or unintentionally; and in nine of those plays a slave is the trickster. Plots of plays in all ages have rested on the craft and subtlety of slaves or valets.³

There was an artful valet in the *Frogs* of Aristophanes; Terence's Phormio was an artful valet. (Pseudolus, Curculio, and others played the same rôle in Plautus' comedies.) In half the plays of Molière there are valets, nearly all artful; one is the hero of *Les Fourberies de Scapin*; another plays Providence to the young people in *L'Avare*; two others diddle the heroines of *Les Précieuses Ridicules*; a fifth runs *L'Étourdi* all by himself. Generation after generation of artful individual valets were born, flourished and died, till there grew up a typical or universal conception of the artful valet, "in himself," and since that time he has nearly always conformed to type. He is the registered chauffeur

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

² Helen E. Wieand (Mrs. Samuel Valentine Cole), *Deception in Plautus, A Study of the Technique of Roman Comedy* (Dissertation, Bryn Mawr, 1918).

³ C. E. Montague, *Dramatic Values*, p. 28.

of comic heroes not up to driving themselves; he knows all the standard ways of going into the ditch, and even the ingredients of devotion to his own interests and his master's have fixed proportions in his composition.

Plautus recognized the delight which an audience felt in seeing somebody fooled or acting under misapprehension of some kind, as in the *Menaechmi*, for example, and he catered to this taste. There are not a few possibilities of permutation and combination in the details connected with such a plot of deception, and Plautus seems to have realized them all.

The chief means employed by Plautus for such deception was personation. In fact it seems to be a stock situation with the playwright and is used by him in ten of the comedies, the *Amphitruo*, *Captivi*, *Persa*, *Epidicus*, *Pseudolus*, *Miles*, *Asinaria*, *Poenulus*, *Curculio*, and *Trinummus*, wherein a real person is imitated without his knowledge, or an exchange of rôles is made between two characters, or an imaginary person is conceived of. And the dénouement comes either through the appearance of the person imitated, or through the intervention of a third person. "Sardou and others have said there are only seven, eight, or some other moderate number of primordial dramatic situations in the world. One of them must be the situation where master and valet change clothes."¹ Plautus' *Captivi* is the first instance in Roman drama. And indeed, as someone has said, "Plautus' pleasant shadow hangs over all plays containing disguise plots."

There is no need to mention *The Comedy of Errors* as a direct imitation of the *Menaechmi*, except with an additional pair of twins. Of recent plays which contain the feature of intentional personation we would mention Barrie's *Quality Street* and *Rosalind*, Oscar Wilde's *The Importance of Being Earnest*, and Jones and Herman's melodrama *The Silver King*.

In *Quality Street*, Phoebe pretends to be her own niece of her imagining. "I am, let me see," she says, when she wants to arouse the love of her own one-time lover, "I am my niece," and she emphasizes her change in identity by her reiteration of it. At the ball which Miss Phoebe attends in her new rôle, one of her old pupils, become a wall-flower beside the Phoebe metamorphosed

¹ Montague, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

into Livvy, the belle of the ball, says bitterly, emphasizing for the audience the personation, "If Miss Phoebe were here, I am sure she would not allow her old pupils to be so neglected." And the playwright gives in the stage directions, "The only possible reply for Miss Susan (Phoebe's sister) is to make herself look small as possible." Humor is added, too, by the suspicions of the spying old-maid neighbors and Phoebe's apprehensions of their suspicions. Her confession to the lover at the end of the play spurs him on to action and he manages to dispose of the mythical niece, Livvy.

Even more humorous is the personation in *Rosalind*, wherein the actress, who is, as she herself puts it, "forty and a bittock" and "not only dowdy but self-consciously enamoured of her dowdiness, having a kiss for it, so to speak," pretends to be the mother of herself, Rosalind, for the sake of the youthful adorer who has fallen in love with her, the actress, in her stage rôle. A hint of the dénouement is given to the audience in her remark, "Did I tell you that I have never seen Beatrice act?" She brings the disillusionment with the same "forty and a bittock," and the recognition from a scissors' cut on her wrist. "Ah, to be stabbed by the voice you have loved!" But even then she tries to console the discomfited young man with the assurance that "All life's a game," and that her rôle is now "mamma," now "Rosalind."

In *The Importance of Being Earnest*, Algy takes advantage of Jack's confession of having invented, for certain useful purposes, the fiction of a younger brother, to pretend to be that brother, Ernest. And the pretense turns out to be fact, when Lady Bracknell discovers that Jack is really her nephew and Algy's brother. "What do you think this means, Lady Bracknell," asks Dr. Chasuble, the old friend of the family; and the lady in her stupefaction replies, "I dare not even suspect, Dr. Chasuble. I need hardly tell you that in families of high position strange coincidences are not supposed to occur. They are hardly considered the thing." The families in Plautus, and in the New Comedy, must according to that restriction be far from high; for strange coincidences and stranger recognitions are decidedly "the thing" among them.

In *The Silver King*, the hero under arrest for murder, though unjustly, flees to the silver fields of the West, and there amasses a great fortune. Upon his return to his home in England, after some years, rich and with a firm conviction of his own innocence, he assumes another name for the time being. But with his disguise it is somewhat like that of the stage detective who boasted of the superiority of his rôle.

"It takes a cleverer man to be a stage detective than to be one in real life," said he.

"Oh, rot! What do you mean, anyhow?" asked his friend.

"Sure it does!" he affirmed. "The stage detective has to disguise himself so cleverly that no character in the play will recognize him, while every person in the audience does."

And in all personations in the drama, especially in Plautus, it does seem that the "recognition" on the part of the characters in the play comes very slowly. The audience is "on" to the deception long before the persons most vitally concerned by it are. But the recognition scene needs no more than a few words from us, when we recall the able presentation of it as a theme in all drama, from Euripides down to the present day, given to us in this association last year by Professor Williams, of Mount Holyoke.

In Plautus nine plays end with an "anagnorisis." We have seen how Sir James Barrie manages that feature today. In *The Silver King*, Jaikes, the faithful servant of Denver, speaks the revealing words, "the hair grown grey, but the same face." We think of the aged Ulysses and the humble slave woman, washing his weary feet and recognizing her young master grown old through the years of his wanderings.

All conscious personation, as well as any kind of trickery, depends upon lies for its successful accomplishment. And the comedies of Plautus abound in them, both direct and outright lies, or the more subtle strategic statements necessitated by a frequently complex plot.

Among vices, lying is a good one for stage purposes. With its brisk and obvious immediate effects of struck and puzzled faces, of action at cross purposes, the graveling of A, the palpable bewilderment of B, the staggering horror or shame of C, it is just the quality to be played with by the one art

that attempts visible and audible effects. Ralph Roister-Doister found out, Falstaff cornered after the affair of Gadshill, Goldsmith's Lofty confronted with the great man of whose friendship he had boasted, Algernon caught at his "bunburying," Agatha Posket struggling to extricate herself from the results of her lie, these are typically theatrical as opposed to narrative achievements, because their full value depends on their being seen as well as heard. The looks of them are half the sport; it is a fun essentially visual and spectacular. Mr. H. A. Jones in his *Liars* follows the best and oldest examples—better still, he tries to play the old game in a new way of his own. The old way was to have all the lying done by one person, to make one character the personification of untruthfulness (like the *Pseudolus* of Plautus), and to keep him steadily lying throughout, confounding many and at last himself confounded. Such too is the progress of Dorante in Corneille's *Le Menteur*.¹

But perhaps on a nearer level to the "menteurs" of Plautus' comedies are the characters in the very recent farces, *Nothing but the Truth* and its companion-piece *Nothing but Lies*. "They are far from being high-browed," as some critic has said, "but they will make even the high-browed laugh. And to be made to laugh in these days of small portions and high prices is to enjoy a real privilege."

Bernard Shaw criticized *The Importance of Being Earnest* because it wastes your time in not touching you as well as amusing you. But "one may hold that laughter, like bread, is a thing which has worth in itself so far as it goes; the bread may also sustain a whole garrison, or the laughter conduce to Christian charity and brotherhood; and, even without these higher offices, bread and laughter are good."²

Of course, a clear exposition of the plot, whether it center in deception, or personation, or what not, is necessary for an appreciation, on the part of the audience, of the comic elements in it; and Plautus attained that clearness, in spite of the neglect which he showed toward some unessential details. The chief means whereby he gained that clearness of plan and execution, which combine to make up a plot, was by the frequent repetition of the details involved. "That prolixity of Plautus," says Brander Matthews,³

¹ Montague, *op. cit.*, pp. 213 f.

² *Ibid.*, p. 187.

³ *Development of the Drama*, p. 100.

"is only an exaggeration of that recommended by the old London stage-manager who said that if you wanted the British public to understand anything, you must tell them that you are going to do it, next you must tell them you are doing it, and at last you must tell them you have done it; and then, confound 'em, perhaps they'll understand you!" M. Legrand, the French student of the New Comedy, in his *Daos*,¹ implies the same need in the case of the Roman audience when he asserts of Plautus, "il a voulu surtout être compris—compris de la masse, des ἀσύνετοι ἀκροαται, comme des auditeurs intelligents."

Many plays of Plautus might be used to illustrate this point, but we will cite only one, the *Menaechmi*. With the first appearance of Menaechmus I—for the plot as you remember centers in the confusion of identity between twin brothers—are introduced the details about which focus the subsequent confusion: the meddlesome wife, vss. 122 ff., 161; the *meretrix*, vss. 124, 130, 173; the wife's *palla* stolen as a gift for the *meretrix*, vss. 130, 166; the ubiquitous parasite. With Menaechmus' presentation of the *palla* to the *meretrix*, vss. 205 ff., in the parasite's presence, all these details are again enumerated. The *meretrix* finally gives the *palla* to the twin brother, mistaking him for her lover, and when the parasite meets Menaechmus II carrying the *palla*, vs. 469, and mistakes him for Menaechmus I, the same details are repeated and the *palla* serves as incriminating evidence. In the final recognition scene, Act V, scene 9, the same details recur. Thus the same details act as connecting links for the chain of the plot. The same thing is true of the handkerchief in *Othello*, for example, or the fan in *Lady Windermere's Fan*.

So Plautus, like the moderns, left no doubt in the minds of his audience in regard to important features of his plot. That he was not so careful in unessential details is also true. "The illusion of time"² which it is a dramatist's duty to create he did not always manage successfully. In the *Captivi* the length of time required for the prisoners to make their plans and to exchange their clothes for the assumption of each other's rôle is not considered by the

¹ P. 54.

² Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

playwright. Likewise the length of time required for a journey to and from Elis is improbably set as one day, though this may be used, as has been suggested, to show that the action of the play covers more than one day. In the *Curculio* the same thing is true, in the length of time required for a journey to and from Caria, though in this case the ignorance as to the site of the *Caria* in question renders the chronological difficulty uncertain. In the *Miles* the three years of absence (vs. 350), seem too long for the few incidents allotted to that time. But the entire history of the time was not needed for the plot.

Today, of course, with the printed program to help us, and the use of a dropped curtain to indicate a lapse of time, the demand for chronological probability can be more easily met. But even so the illusion is not always successful. That is the reason, probably, that on the stage very few clocks ever run.

As we all know, and as W. L. George has wittily put it,

Our plays today abound, revel in defects; some of their authors think to find originality in the inversion of fact; others in impossibilities; most of them in obscurity. Naturally we do not charge the serious playwright with having committed the seven cardinal sins of their craft,—the aside, the soliloquy, impersonation, eavesdropping, confidences, the losing of papers, and the wrongful assumption of guilt. But if they have avoided the seven cardinal sins they have conjured up as many devils as they cast out,—the shadowy plot, the play without a climax, hypertrophy of the atmosphere, sentiment, (sometimes) garrulousness, the exaggerated type, inveterate gloom (sometimes), optimism, obscurity, length, and shapeless purpose.¹

Plautus must plead guilty to almost all of these "seven deadly sins," and confess to being possessed with many of these devils. Here, too, he shows his kinship with many of the playwrights of today.

Plautus is criticized, too, for dropping unessential characters after their part is done, who seem brought in merely to contribute their little share to the development of the plot and who then drop out of sight. Palinurus in the *Curculio* is such a character. Similarly the *fidicina* in the *Epidicus*, Callipho in the *Pseudolus*, and Philematium in the *Mostellaria*, disappear. Oscar Wilde is criticized for the same thing.

¹ *Dramatic Actualities*, p. 6.

In *A Woman of No Importance*, after more than one act of stationary, ingenious and obscure entertainment, Wilde begins the play with a telling final scene, and this change to real drama causes a dreadful mortality among the undramatic figures of the first act. As the play goes on, the unessential characters disappear. As soon as dramatic business is meant, there is no place for them; they have to pack up their epigrams and go.¹

Plautus' characters do not only talk; they also act. But he feels perfectly free to dispense entirely with them, when the action focuses upon some other figure.

There is one more device for comic effect which we wish to mention in conclusion, that of haste contradicted by delay, i.e., "of someone rushing madly across stage at top-speed, in search of somebody right under his nose, the while unburdening himself of exhaustive periods, or wasting his time in soliloquizing."² Curculio does this, vss. 279 ff. Leonida, in the *Asinaria*, vs. 267, rushes in in great excitement, seeking his fellow-slave, but wastes sixty lines bandying words with him before he relates the business which had seemed so urgent. Stasimus in the *Trinummus*, vss. 1,001 ff., though his mission is also proclaimed as desperately urgent, pauses to declaim on public morals. The *Captivi*, vss. 781 ff., *Pseudolus*, *Epidicus*, vss. 1 ff., *Mercator*, vss. 111 ff., *Stichus*, vss. 274 ff., and *Persa*, vss. 272 ff., offer additional instances. The impression upon an audience is just what Plautus worked to produce, amusement at the wrangling and not annoyance at the unwarranted interruption of the action, which an uncritical audience would fail to notice.

Since the discarding, from drama today, of the soliloquy, which was a very present help in time of trouble, and the aside, as departures from naturalism in dramatic speech, such scenes are no longer common in high-class plays. But they still survive in low comedy types and in vaudeville skits, which appeal today to just the same sort of audience for which Plautus wrote his plays so long ago. To those features may be added the other dramatic absurdities in Plautus, bombast, burlesque, horse-play, pointless quips, and so on, which were then, as now, so highly effective a theatrical mechanism for the unlimited production of laughter.³ They are, to be sure, far from being drama, though

¹ Montague, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

² W. W. Blancké, *The Dramatic Values in Plautus* (Diss.), p. 45.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 69.

following a dramatic form. Mommsen called them caricature. But they are more than that. The plays all have definite plots, and Plautus' art, as Leo indicated,¹ is manifest in his success in making the action, plus these extraneous details, poetically and theatrically probable.

To the Romans of Plautus' day the machinations of a slave were just as interesting as to their ancestors the wiles of a Ulysses or of a Sinon, or to their descendants of today the detective work of a Sherlock Holmes or the dual personality of a Dr. Jekyll or a Monte Cristo. Plautus' creative genius appears in the way in which he met the demands of the *vis comica*. Without violating in too open a fashion the reality of rôles and situations, he performed the full duty of a dramatist² of making his audience understand the events which took place in their due relations, and of amusing and entertaining them.

In much the same way the theater of today performs the same function, in spite of all the big things that are going on in the world, and in local competition with cabarets, moving pictures, Liberty Bond sales, suffrage importunities, political contests, prohibition, short sugar, and its own intrinsic defects. As long as the modern stage reflects truthfully and absolutely the life and environment about us—every class, every kind, every emotion, every motive, every occupation, every business, every idleness—its success is assured. That same humanity and universality is what made Plautus successful.

"I met a hundred men in the road to Delhi," runs a Punjab proverb, "and they were all my brothers." So "every stage of man's life, as it was lived at Rome from the cradle to the grave, is represented in Plautus' plays. And in the portrayal of that life around him and in imparting fresh, wide-open life and human mirth, Plautus developed a gift which is the possession"³ of some of our contemporary playwrights. Therein Plautus has showed pre-eminently his kinship with the writers of the best in comedy today.

¹ *Römische Literatur*, p. 105.

² Legrand, *Daos*, p. 490.

³ Westaway, *The Original Element in Plautus*, pp. 37 f.

OUR ANCESTRY LINGUISTIC¹

By J. E. HOLLINGSWORTH
Washburn College

Beneath the green sod of the surface of most modern languages lie dead bones. A language dies, but it does not generally all die. When the group of people who spoke it has for any reason become scattered or extinct, and the language no longer functions as a living organism, it is said to be dead. But a series of dialects may have sprung up in its place, widely spoken and bearing resemblance. The fossilized remains of a past civilization may record a pinnacle of advance in science, a norm for the art and architecture of succeeding generations. Or the dead language may have transmitted a sacred literature, a great system of philosophy, a legal code. In such cases a language has clothed itself with immortality.

Will the Hebrew Scriptures or the New Testament die? Will the *Iliad*, the *Aeneid*, the *Divine Comedy* perish from the earth; *Antigone*, *Faust*, or *King Lear* be forgotten? The author of *World Literature* (chap. ii) says:

I start from the position that our English civilization is the product of two main factors, the gradual union of which has made us what we are. . . . The one is the ancient Hellenic civilization embodied in the classical literature of Greece and Rome. The other is that special strain of Hebrew civilization which is crystallized in that literature we call the Bible. Our science, our art, our philosophy, our politics, are, in the main, the continuation of processes commenced by the ancient Greeks. But in our spiritual nature we are not

¹ For matters of English philology and language history, touched on in this paper in a cursory manner, the following books will be found useful: Bradley, *The Making of English* (Macmillan, 1904), Earle, *Philology of the English Tongue* (Clarendon Press, 1891), Emerson, *History of the English Language* (Macmillan, 1894), Greenough and Kittredge, *Words and Their Ways in English* (Macmillan, 1901), Jespersen, *Growth and Structure of the English Language* (Teubner, 1918), Meiklejohn, *History of the English Language*, Part III (D. C. Heath, 1906), Oertel, *Lectures on the Study of Language* (Scribners, 1902), Skeat, *Principles of Etymology* (Oxford, 1892), Trench, *English Past and Present* (14th ed., revised by Mayhew, London, 1898), Whitney, *Life and Growth of Language* (Appleton, 1875).

Greek, but Hebrew—product of the spiritual movement which has made the Bible. The evolution of our modern life rests upon the gradual intermingling of these Hellenic and Hebraic elements.

Again, not every language when it has fallen into the earth abides alone. From the grave a new generation in kind may issue forth, with abundant life. Sanskrit, the classical language of India, is dead, but the kindred dialects that have sprung up in its place are myriad. French, Italian, Spanish, the galaxy of Romance languages, are severally the developed dialects of folk-Latin which was established in those regions by the Roman warriors.

So a language may live on in its descendants. And the Genius of Language does not, in the ordinary course of events, abandon its ancestors to utter oblivion. Useless words and forms are sloughed off; new additions are made. An organism, and not a mechanism, a living language is continually vibrating with energy. But even in the case of an indigenous language the essential mechanism of its grammar and the bulk of its commonest words are usually a heritage from the dead past; change and decay do not seriously affect the skeleton. And a dead language, whose words and integral parts are constant in form and significance, is of great importance to linguistic science, if we are to study the anatomy, the growth and structure, as well as the outward features and vital forces of a living language.

I am not here to bury Caesar or to praise him. Of language ancestry I sing, and I invite your attention to our English—or shall I say barbaric—forebears. If we were to fix the horizon of modern English, it would perhaps be about the year 1500, when the effects of the introduction of printing had begun to be felt in England. Chaucer, who died about three-quarters of a century earlier, had fixed the English literary dialect when he chose the Mercian, or Midland, his native London form of speech. The discovery of the New World had profoundly stimulated men's minds, and the language was about to set out on the most glorious period of its development under Tyndal, Shakspere, Dryden, Swift, Johnson, Coleridge, and Macaulay.

If, standing at a point in this horizon, we were to scan the long vista of the formative period of our language, one fact in particular

would impress itself on our minds—English was in former times an inflected language. It made use of formative suffixes in adjective, noun, and verb to indicate the logical relation of words within the sentence. Modern German does this, and Russian, but French and most of the European languages, like English only to a much slighter degree, have modified or leveled their inflections, owing to the "analytic" tendency in language, and have developed prepositions and verb auxiliaries to take their place. Word-order has come to be the significant feature of syntax.

This remarkable change in the form of English was partly natural and gradual. It was partly cataclysmal and for historical reasons which we shall only hastily review. Intermittently from 55 B.C. to 411 A.D. Roman legions held the island of Britain, and the Latin language was used in the towns. St. Augustine and his confrères at the close of the sixth century introduced a few ecclesiastical terms, but Latin did not gain a considerable hold on the island in the earliest period of our language. The Roman legions had withdrawn for the last time when the Angles, Jutes, and Saxons, our ancestors in line, crossed over from Schleswig in Germany. In four centuries of occupation the aggressors covered almost the whole island, having subjugated the native population so completely that scarce a half-dozen Celtic words are to be found in modern English to remind us of the primitive inhabitants. Their erstwhile brethren of the North, the Danes, invaded Britain in 870. The stratification of early English records no small deposit of Scandinavian words. Then there was the terrific impact of the Norman Conquest. For nearly a century the supremacy of the English language hung in the balance. But Normandy was lost in Northern France, and the foreign lords of Britain became more tolerant of local customs and manners of speech. England looked like home to them. Race mixture produced dialect mixture. The submerged vernacular reappeared and came to constitute the body of the language.

One result of the Norman-French infusion into English was an extensive borrowing of Central French words in the following century. In like manner, at a later period, the impetus given by the Revival of Learning caused English men of letters to draw without

stint from Latin, mother of French, and from Greek models. These later French and classical additions of English were "learned" words, and they did not become domesticated so rapidly as the Scandinavian and Norman-French elements. So extensive, however, were the ingraftings on the Anglo-Saxon stock, so desperate was the struggle for existence during the formative period of our language, that the power of development from within—from internal linguistic resources—was once and for all lost. The natural well-spring of our language was estopped. The habit of borrowing became fixed. Our supply of words continues to be replenished, in the main, directly from abroad, or from formative elements of foreign origin.

"I trade," says Dryden, "with the living and the dead for the enrichment of our native language." The loan-words in English were naturalized—by an interesting process which cannot detain us here—and there was almost complete fusion with the native element. No modern language is wholly free from the infection of borrowed words, and perhaps they are not altogether a detriment. Students of language have admired the richness and flexibility of English, pronouncing it no mean instrument of expression. But the native strain in our language is, we repeat, Teutonic. The homespun element is the warp and woof of our linguistic web. The grammatical forms, the verbal system, the declension of nouns and pronouns, the comparison of adjectives, and most of the purely relational words, such as simple adverbs, prepositions, and conjunctions, are native. The words for numbers below a million, and the ordinals, except second, have always been in the language. "Anglo-Saxon" we call this native core of our language, unmodified by subsequent accretions from Scandinavian, Norman-French, and classical sources.

Philologists tell us the Anglo-Saxons spoke a Low German tongue, cognate with Icelandic, Old Frisian, and Old High German—members all of the Teutonic branch of the Indo-European family of languages. Besides the features of inflection, our language inherited the general family characteristic of vowel variation in the body of a word—to indicate change in part of speech, or in number or tense. To put it another way, the categories of case,

number, person, mood, and tense, and the types of so-called "irregular" nouns and verbs, are found already well developed in Gothic, the oldest of the group of languages to which English belongs, and hence must have descended to us from the parent Indo-European.

The Teutonic group, as compared with the primitive language, featured a characteristic succession of consonants, a changed word-accent which was fixed on the root syllable, a twofold declension of nouns and adjectives, and a peculiar system of verb inflection. The bulk of loan-words in English, except those from our kinsmen, the Scandinavians, belonged to groups cognate with English, and to two in particular, the Italic and the Hellenic. With other branches of the Indo-European family, the Celtic, the Balto-Slavic, the Indo-Iranian, we have little in common except the general family characteristics aforementioned. From other families of language, particularly the Semitic, have come small but important deposits of words, along with those special contributions to civilization—the Hebrew Scriptures, the Phoenician alphabet, the Arabic system of notation, Chaldean and Egyptian science.

Since the discovery of Sanskrit the Indo-European family of languages (variously called Indo-Germanic, Aryan) has been a subject of study—Eldorado of philologists. A writer on the subject says:

There is no doubt that the eight groups of this family go back to one original language, and from a comparison of the forms in these various languages we are able to ascertain what the original form in the primitive Indo-European language may have been. Unfortunately we cannot bring our induction to the test by comparing the hypothetical form with the genuine, for not one word of this original tongue has come down to us. Our knowledge of the original home is equally meager. . . . Perhaps no peoples have wandered so much to and fro upon the face of the earth as the Indo-Europeans; at the dawn of the historic period we find the Indo-Iranian, the Slavonic, the Germanic, the Celtic races in a state of migration.¹

A few years ago it was the common belief that the original home was somewhere in Central or Northern Europe. But the recent discovery of documents in the Tokhari language, spoken by tribes

¹ Giles, *Manual of Comparative Philology*, pp. 22, 23.

in what is now Chinese Turkestan, has caused many to regard a European home as unlikely, and to revert to the previous theory of an Asiatic home.

A comparison of the peculiarities of each language shows that the primitive people must have diverged gradually at first, these divergences later increasing into extensive migrations. Local differences of dialect became more marked, and the several languages, developing in isolation, became mutually unintelligible. It is only in comparatively recent times that their kinship has been re-established. One important result of this interesting work of reconstruction has been that we no longer regard one language of this great group as being vastly older than another. Sanskrit is the elder sister of Greek and Latin, not the mother, as was formerly supposed. Latin is not derived from Greek, but is cognate with it; and for the native strain in English we claim equally direct descent.

"We find that many words were known to several of the Indo-Germanic groups," says Skeat, "and are to be found in Asia as well as Europe." He distributes them into categories, as follows:

- (a) Terms of relationship, and the like: brother, daughter, father, mother, sister; kin, widow, and guest.
- (b) Parts of the body, and the like: arm, brow, chin, ear, elbow, foot, heart, knee, marrow, navel, nose, tooth; tear (sb.), udder (of a cow).
- (c) Birds and animals: beaver, crane, cow, ewe, goose, hart, hound, mouse, sow, steer; feather (of a bird), horn (of an animal), wool.
- (d) Seasons: day, harvest, night, year. Natural objects and the like: apple, birch, bough, east, frost, light, moon, star, stream, tree, water, wind.
- (e) Home and employments: acre, axle, door, dough, lea, mark (a boundary), mead, nave (of a wheel), thatch, timber, wain, work, yard (a court), yeast, yoke.
- (f) Miscellaneous substantives: bottom, life, loan, love, meed, mind, murder, name, speed, sweat, thirst.
- (g) Some adjectives: foul, full, lief, light, loud, mid, naked, new, quick, raw, red, right, same, sweet, tame, thin, warm, yellow, young.
- (h) Numerals: eight, five, four, hundred, nine, one, seven, six, ten, three, two.
- (i) Pronouns: I, me, that, thou, what, who, ye (you). Adverb: now. Preposition: of (off).
- (k) Verbs: am, are, be, is, was; also: bear, bid, bind, choose, do, ear (plough), eat, fare, know, lean, lick, lie (recline), live, milk, reave, sew, sit, spurn, stand, tear, wax (grow), weigh, will, win, work, worth (become), yearn.¹

¹ *Science of Etymology*, p. 202.

The list is not intended to be exhaustive, but it shows sufficiently the character of the language material which our primitive ancestors possessed. From such a deposit of words, determined by mutual correspondences in form and meaning, must be derived the scant inferences regarding the history and civilization of this remote period. It is generally agreed that there are three main "stages" in the development of a language from a lower to a higher form: the isolating (or monosyllabic), the agglutinative (or polysynthetic), and the inflectional. Sanscrit, Greek, Latin, and Gothic, worthy dead of our linguistic ancestry, are known to have been highly inflectional. In times prehistoric, then, the Indo-European languages must have passed through the first two stages into the inflectional. It is likely that English (and, indeed, most of the great modern languages) is now in a fourth or "analytic" stage of development, where the tendency is to break down inflections and develop auxiliary words to facilitate expression.

Comparative philology does not attempt to fix exact limits for the period when the Indo-European family was an undivided whole. The Vedic hymns of Sanscrit constitute the oldest literary records. An authority remarks that the parent people "were still in the Stone Age for the most part, though copper was beginning to come in, and the time must therefore have been not later than 2500 B.C."

The region inhabited is supposed to have been a varied one, not bordering the sea. Winter is the most common term for season. The loosely organized tribes wandered about over the grasslands tending their cattle and sheep. Yet some of the tribes had adopted a settled mode of life, possessing fields which they tilled. They had wheeled carts, and knew the use of the plow. Barley, and possibly wheat, was used to make bread. The art of weaving (from wool and hemp) was practiced. The horse and the ox had been domesticated. They dreaded the ravages of the bear and the wolf among their flocks; the mouse was even then a domestic pest. There were towns and fortified places. Knowing the use of certain metals, they made themselves primitive weapons of offense and defense. Of government and organization they probably knew little. Terms denoting various degrees of family

relationship were well developed and "were significant of affectionate regard and trustful interdependence" (Whitney). A highly gifted and imaginative people, they appear to have early displayed the qualities which were to enable them to exert a vast influence on civilization.

Breasted records the gradual assembling of the Semitic nomads on what he calls the "fertile crescent" of the Arabian desert, and then traces the slow southern advance of the hosts of the Indo-Europeans from Central Europe behind the Balkans, from the steppes of Southern Russia, and from far into Asia east of the Caspian Sea.

The history of the ancient world is largely made up of the struggle between this southern Semitic line which issued from the southern grasslands, and the northern Indo-European line which came forth from the northern grasslands to confront the older civilization represented in the southern line. Thus we see the two great races facing each other across the Mediterranean like two vast armies stretching from western Asia westward to the Atlantic. The later wars of Rome and Carthage represent some of the operations on the Semitic left wing; while the triumph of Persia over Chaldea is a similar outcome on the Semitic right wing. The result of the imposing struggle was the complete triumph of our ancestors, the Indo-European line, which conquered along the center and both wings and gained unchallenged supremacy throughout the Mediterranean world under the Greeks and the Romans. This triumph was accompanied by a long struggle for the mastery between members of the northern line themselves, as first the Persians, then the Greeks, and finally the Romans, gained complete control of the Mediterranean and oriental world. The great civilized peoples of Europe at the present day are the offspring of the victorious Indo-European line.¹

¹ Robinson and Breasted, *Outlines of European History*, Part I, p. 87. See chaps. iii and iv.

AD ALPES¹

By H. C. NUTTING
University of California

I²

Navis iam per undas perlabitur, omnesque in puppi consistentes litus leniter e conspectu recedens conspiciebant. Ac postremo Drusilla: "Tres iam sunt anni," inquit, "cum in hac terra barbara habitamus. Quam guadeo nobis denique licere domum reverti ut tandem patriam et parentes nostros visamus!"

Tum Cornelius: "Recte dicas," inquit: "sed dum hic morabamur, multa miranda et iucunda vidimus, nec me paenitet his in terris longinquis triennium hoc transegisse. Sed nunc domi esse maxime cupio, ut Publius noster et Sextus omnia discant, quae civibus Romanis nota esse debent. Et ego ipse forum templa deorum libentissime iterum aspiciam."

"Urbem vix in mentem revocare possum," inquit Cornelius; "tam eram parvula, cum huc profecti sumus"; tum subito se convertens ad Lucium, quem Anna in gremio sago contectum tenebat: "Et Lucius noster eam numquam omnino aspexit." Quae cum dixisset, fratrem parvum cupide amplexa est.

"Suadeo, uxor," inquit Cornelius, "ut cum liberis tu nunc in cameram redeas; nam ventus increbescit. Sed ego et pueri paulo diutius in puppi ambulabimus."

Cum Drusilla cum liberis servisque in cameram se recepisset, tum Publius, ut ultro citroque ambulabant: "Videor mihi recordari,"

¹ Copyright by H. C. Nutting, 1921.

² This is the first chapter of a story of the travels of the family of a fictitious person named Publius Cornelius Strabo, who is represented as a Roman official stationed for some time in Asia Minor, and recalled to Rome on the death of Hadrian (138 A.D.). His wife is Drusilla; and they have four children, Publius, Sextus, Cornelia, and Lucius, aged respectively sixteen, twelve, eight, and a year and a half. Three of their slaves require special mention: Onesimus, an elderly man, who acts as steward; Stasimus, a home-born servant, much indulged, and Anna, a maid from Palestine, who has special charge of Lucius. The story opens as the party sets sail from Asia Minor, not knowing whither Cornelius will be sent after reaching Rome.

inquit, "quondam fuisse periculum in mari Aegaeo navigare propter piratas, qui ubique castella haberent, unde in naves mercatorum impetus facerent repentinus."

"Per multos annos res ita se habebat," inquit Cornelius; "et mercatores hoc modo saepe perierunt, navesque eorum aut incensae sunt aut in mari submersae. Quin etiam piratae isti postremo tam audaces facti sunt, ut naves quoque adorirentur quibus vehebantur magistratus populi Romani."

"Papae!" inquit Sextus. "Nonne nomen magnum populi Romani veriti sunt? Cur non naves longae istos scelestos statim e mari fugaverunt?"

"Saepe id temptatum est," inquit pater; "Sed, ut est in vetere proverbio, 'incipere multo est quam impetrare facilius.' Quo modo factum est ut, cum naves alios consecarentur, alii procul praedas agerent; nec finis fuit, priusquam custodia totius orae maritimae Gnaeo Pompeio Magno commissa est. Is tam acriter piratas lacessivit, ut sexaginta diebus omnes aut fugerent aut legatos pacis petendae causa ad eum mittere cogerentur."

Tum Publius: "Nonne Iulius Caesar ipse olim in potestatem istorum piratarum pervenit?"

"Recte dicens," inquit Cornelius. "Insulam Rhodum adire volebat, ut Apollonium Molonem, clarissimum dicendi magistrum ibi audiret. Huc dum hibernis mensibus transit, a piratis captus est, apud quos mansit dies fere quadraginta; interim comites Romam dimissi erant pecunias petitum quibus redimeretur. Dum ibi moratur, cum piratis comiter iocatus, saepe pollicitus est se reversum ab eis supplicium summum sumpturum. Illi scilicet adriserunt. Sed Caesar, cum pecunia numerata in litore deserto expositus esset, Miletum profectus est: ubi classe deducta piratas abeuntes est secutus, eosque omnes suppicio adfecit quod antea quasi per iocum minatus erat."

"Quam vellem," inquit Sextus, "piratae hodie quoque in hoc mari navigarent! Si nostram navem adoriantur, ego eis capita abscidam, priusquam in puppim escendere possint."

"Heia," inquit Publius, cum se horrere simularet; "quam bene piratis accidit Sextum nostrum illis temporibus maria non navigasse!"

Tum Sextus ira incensus; "Noli te iactare. Tu etsi maior natu
es, ego tamen sum fortior."

"Agite, filii," inquit Cornelius. "Inter vos desinite iurgare.
Tales rixae indecorae sunt. Sed existimo iam Onesium curasse
ut esset quod ederemus. Eamus intro." Quae cum dixisset, ad
cameram pedem convertit; ac Publius et Sextus, qui male esurie-
bant, libentur subsecuti sunt.

II

Illa nave vehebantur homines multi; sed dies complures tam
asperum erat mare, ut plerique graviter nausea afficerentur,
paucique in puppi ambulare possent. Mirus et molestissimus
est hic morbus: qui enim eo afficitur, primo timet ne moriatur,
tum veretur ne in vita retineatur.

Postremo autem omnibus melius est factum, rarique in puppim
prodierunt. In eis erat senex quidam, qui lingua barbara utebatur,
nec quisquam plane intellegere poterat quid dicere vellet.

Tum mercator dives, qui nequiquam cum sene loqui conatus
erat: "Nonne est hic quisquam," inquit, "qui linguam huius pere-
grini intellegat?"

Forte Stasimus haud procul stabat. Qui cum haec audivisset,
ut erat vafer, "Ego," inquit, "linguas omnes scio. Si mihi exposu-
eris quid rogare velis, ego libenter cum sene loquar." Quo dicto,
ad senem accessit, et sermo huius modi institutus est:

Stasimus. Salve multum, senex.

Senex. Avo. Donni.¹

Mercator. Quid dicit, obsecro?

Stasimus. Dicit se iubere te salvere, et tibi donum dare velle.

Mercator. Benigne facit. Sed quaere, quis homo sit aut
unde veniat.

Senex. Me har bocca.

Stasimus. Dicit buccam dolere.

Mercator. Fortasse nos esse medicos putat. Quaere, sis;
nam hospitem sic errare nolo.

¹ This gibberish of course means nothing to Stasimus; but in each case he catches the suggestion of a Latin word or two, and audaciously invents an "interpretation" accordingly (e.g., *Donni* suggests *donum*).

Senex. Murph ursa mvulc.
 Mercator. Quid nunc dicit?
 Stasimus. Dicit se ursas vendere velle.
 Mercator. Forsitan bestias comparet ad munus populi.
 Senex. Palu mer ged etha.
 Stasimus. Dicit se palas quoque vendere.
 Mercator. Ad terram effodiendam, credo. Sed vix intellegere possum cur negotia tam diversa suscipiat.

Senex. Murphonnum sucorhim.
 Mercator. Quid dicit, obsecro?
 Stasimus. Te iubet sub corbem repere.
 Mercator. Papae! Delirat profecto.
 Dum hic sermo habetur, Publius et Sextus prope astabant, vix se continentes quominus in cachinnos erumperent. Sed iam e camera processit Cornelius, et Stasimus celeriter in puppim extremam se recepit. Quo facto, Cornelio mercator; "Estne ille Stasimus servus tuus?" inquit.

"Ita," inquit Cornelius, "nec usquam est homo sclestior."
 "Haud ita mihi videtur," inquit mercator; "nam modo mihi operam benigne dabat, cum hunc perigrinum quaedam rogare vellem."

"Quo modo, obsecro, ille operam tibi dare potuit?" inquit Cornelius. "Multis linguis ego utor; sed ne ego quidem intellegere poteram quid ille ignotus dicere vellet, cum me paulo ante compellaret. Stasimus nihil nisi Latine scit."

"Suspicio eum me ludificatum esse," inquit mercator ridens. "Sed sine dubio omnia per iocum fecit; et spero te ab eo supplicium non sumpturum."

Tum Cornelius: "Dolis eius interdum ira tam incendor, ut vix me continere possim quin eum statim in crucem agam. Cum autem tu tam clementer suadeas, poenas non dabit—donec iterum noxiā merebitur."

Dum illi ita inter se loquuntur, peregrinus spe omni destitutus caput quassans tristis discessit. Interim Publius et Sextus ad proram processerunt, ubi stabant fluctus magnos admirantes. Et Sextus: "In hoc mari," inquit, "umquam pugna magna commissa est?"

"Olim," inquit Publius, "Antiochus et Hannibal in mari Pamphilio cum Rhodiorum classe confixerunt. Ac paulo post idem Poenus hostem alium miris modis fugavit, cum Eumeni, regi Pergameno, bellum inferret."

"De hac pugna numquam audivi," inquit Sextus. "Quid factum est?"

Tum Publius: "Modo librum Cornelii Nepotis legebam, qui rem gestam ita tradit; Hannibal navium numero superabatur; itaque dolo ei pugnandum erat. Quare suos iussit venenatas serpentes vivas quam plurimas colligere, easque in vasa fictilia conicere. Cum dies pugnae venisset, imperavit ut omnes in Eumenis solum concurrerent navem, ceteras autem neglegerent. Quod ubi factum est, navis Eumenis fuga salutem petere coacta est, sed ceterae undique classem Hannibalim vehementer premebant. Tum in eas repente vasa fictilia, de quibus supra mentionem feci, coniecta sunt. Quibus in puppes fractis, naves hostium brevi serpentibus oppletae sunt, atque illi, nova re territi, terga verterunt regemque Eumenem intra praesidia, quae in proximo litore collocata erant, celeriter secuti sunt."

"Hahae!" inquit Sextus; "Hannibal certe dux callidus erat. Vix turpe erat a tanto imperatore vinci."

Tum Publius, post se respiciens: "Puto," inquit, "nos nunc tuto redire posse. Stasimus videtur poenas effugisse, nec hospes usquam in conspectu est."

Itaque e prora recesserunt, et se reddiderunt patri ceterisque, qui passim in puppi sedebant.

[*To be continued*]

TRAINING SOLDIERS FOR THE ROMAN LEGION

By S. E. STOUT
Indiana University

Modern trench fighting, with its larger use of the bayonet, has brought methods of warfare much nearer to those employed in ancient times than they have ever been since the art of war was revolutionized by the invention of gunpowder. From the ancient Egyptian and Assyrian armies to the decay of chivalry the offensive and defensive equipment of the private soldier, the actual combat in the battle line, and the methods of attacking and defending fortified positions remained essentially the same. The greatest advance in warfare in that time was in tactics, in the methods of organizing and ordering bodies of men so that they could be directed and maneuvered more effectively. The decision of battle lay in the hand-to-hand fighting with the sword. But the invention of gunpowder separated the lines of combatants farther. With the rifle they rarely came to close contact for one line or the other usually gave way before they came together. It requires courage and skill to use a rifle coolly and effectively a quarter of a mile or more away from the enemy; but a different order of courage and skill is needed by the soldier who is to leap into a trench or an opposing battle line and fight to a decision with enemies armed with bayonet or sword. The latter calls for greater agility and strength, alertness and resourcefulness; it reduces the actual fighting in battle to a series of individual combats in which each man becomes more responsible for his own personal safety and that of his immediate neighbors; it gives greater play to individual prowess and initiative, and in small groups in the line it also leaves greater room for undirected team work.

The training of soldiers has always been planned with a view to the requirements of the particular work to which they were destined. It has been made more or less elaborate and given a longer or shorter time in proportion to the complexity of the

processes to be learned and the knowledge with which the recruits entered the service. The essential points of the theory of soldier-training are the following: (1) recruits must be skilfully selected; (2) they must learn to use and care for their arms; (3) they must be brought to the highest point of physical robustness by daily exercises; (4) they must as far as possible be taught every situation that can arise in battle and how to meet it; (5) they must learn to obey orders and not to shirk work. The Romans recognized the fact that fear with resultant panic is one of the greatest dangers to an army. To banish fear they relied on the confidence that comes with the consciousness of skill. "For knowledge of the game of war leads to boldness in the conflict. No one ever feared to do a thing that he was confident he had learned to do well."¹

The selection of soldiers in the levy in the early Roman army is described by Polybius (vi. 20). Every citizen gave in his name and came to the place of levy. The tribunes of the four legions to be enrolled took seats in four booths. The men of a tribe who had been called for service were grouped into fours, the four men of each group being as nearly equal as possible in all points of fitness. The first group of four was then presented to the tribunes of the first legion who had first choice from the group; the tribunes of the second legion took their choice from the remaining three; those of the third legion took their choice of the remaining two; and the fourth man of the group was assigned to the fourth legion. The next group of four from the tribe was similarly presented to the tribunes of the second, third, and fourth legions in order, and the remaining man was assigned to the first legion. From the next group of four the first choice was given to the tribunes of the third legion, the second to those of the fourth legion, the third choice to the tribunes of the first legion, and the remaining man was assigned to the second legion. This process continued until all the men to be enrolled from a tribe had been distributed to the four legions, giving to each legion groups of equal average excellence.

¹ *Scientia enim rei bellicae dimicandi nutrit audaciam: nemo facere metuit quod se bene didicisse confidit* [Veg. i. 1].

So long as Roman armies were raised at Rome from Roman citizens and were enrolled for one campaign only, to be returned to civilian life after a few weeks or months of service, this method of personal selection was satisfactory. But when, by the introduction of the principle of continuous service in the army and the practice of paying the soldiers, service in the army came to be a vocation; and when also the soldiers began to be levied throughout Italy and the provinces, principles for the guidance of enlistment officers were gradually developed. Marius, for instance, under whom Rome's army became a professional body, required that the height of a soldier should be above a minimum. The requirement that 5 feet 10 inches, Roman measure, which would be about 5 feet 8 inches in our measure, should be the minimum height for a soldier was not, however, insisted upon later when the demand for soldiers became greater than the supply. Other considerations came to be regarded as essential, the height as of less importance. Vegetius sums up the physical requirement for enlistment as follows: "Let, therefore, the youth who is to be chosen for martial tasks have observant eyes, hold his head up, have a broad chest, muscular shoulders, strong arms, long fingers, not too extended a waist measure, lean hams, and calves and feet not distended with superfluous flesh but hard and knotted with muscles. Whenever you find these marks in the recruit, do not be troubled about his height. It is more useful for soldiers to be strong and brave than big."¹

The main reliance in the battle line was always placed in the younger men, but so long as campaigns were short and the army was to be disbanded at the end of the campaign or at any rate by the end of the summer the average age of the soldiers of the legion was considerably higher than the average age at which the recruits for the later legions were accepted. Serving in the army was a normal incident of the life of the Roman youth of the earlier Republic, and his sports and education trained him for this service.

¹ *Sit ergo adulescens Martio operi deputandus vigilantibus oculis, erecta cervice, lato pectore, umeris muscososis, valentibus brachiis, digitis longioribus, ventre modicus, exilior clunibus, suris et pedibus non superflua carne distentis sed nervorum duritia collectis. Cum haec in tirone signa deprehenderis, proceritatem non magno opere desideres. Utilius est enim fortis milites esse quam grandes*" [Veg. i. 6].

Citizens who did not give in their names for the draft were regarded as betrayers of liberty, and as such were sold into slavery. Roman poets and historians always looked upon this age as the golden age of Roman patriotism and national virtue. When enrolled, the younger troops were mixed with more experienced soldiers and, being used at the place in the battle best suited to their experience, they did not require the training of the recruits of a later time. These latter enlisted with little or no previous training especially fitting them for the work of a soldier, and to them arms were to become a vocation rather than to be merely an avocation. They must begin before age had made it impossible for them to be trained to speed and quickness, while they still could learn to jump and to run. Sallust reports that the youth was enlisted as soon as he could stand the physical strain of war; Vegetius says: "No one does not know that with the coming of puberty men were compelled to submit to the levy; for nothing is so quickly or thoroughly acquired as those things whose study is begun from boyhood"; from Livy and Gellius we learn that youths were required to give in their names upon reaching the age of seventeen.

In later times when Rome drew her soldiers from a wide dominion the question was raised, at least academically, as to whether country boys or city boys were the better raw material for soldiers. Vegetius answers as follows: "On this point I think it has never been open to doubt that the youth of the country is better adapted to arms, for it is reared under the open sky and occupied in labor; it is trained to endure the sun and to spurn the shade; it knows nothing of baths nor of delicacies; it is simple-hearted and satisfied with little; its limbs are hardened to endure all kinds of toil; and it has grown accustomed in the country to handling implements of iron, to digging ditches, and carrying loads."¹ One of the surprises of our own recent drafts was that a larger percentage of the

¹ "Sequitur ut utrum de agris an de urbibus utilior tiro sit requiramus. De qua parte numquam credo potuisse dubitari aptiorem armis rusticam plebem quae sub divo et in labore nutritur, solis patiens, umbrae neglegens, balnearum nescia, deliciarum ignara, simplicis animi, parvo contenta, duratis ad omnem laborum tolerantiam membris, cui gestare ferrum, fossam ducere, onus ferre consuetudo de rure est" [Veg. i. 3].

men from the cities than of those from the country was able to pass the physical examination. "The country lad," says General Crowder in his report, "accustomed to hard physical labor may be more muscular than his city cousin, but he is not superior in the possession of the degree of physical soundness essential to his acceptance as a soldier."

In the earlier Republic, when practically every citizen knew the business of soldiering, legions were often led out at once after enrolment to establish contact with the enemy. Under the Empire recruits were first received for a probationary period before final and complete enlistment. During this preliminary period fitness for service had to be proved by three tests: (1) did the candidate possess sufficient *velocitas*? (2) Did he show aptitude for learning to use arms? (3) Did he give promise of the *confidentia militaris*? In addition, before candidates from the city were to be permitted to begin the training in arms, they were to be taught to labor, to run long distances, to carry loads, to bear sun and dust, to put up with short rations of country fare, and to alternate living for periods under the open sky and in tents.

When a recruit had been finally passed his training began in earnest. He was required to learn to march at the ordinary and the fast military pace, the former at the rate of twenty Roman miles in five summer hours and the latter at the rate of twenty-four Roman miles in the same time. To make his preliminary experience more like the later reality and to develop hardihood and strength, he was required to carry a seventy-pound pack on his march. One is here reminded of President Roosevelt's order, which at the time was received in army circles with noticeable lack of enthusiasm, that all officers and men of the army in time of peace should execute long marches each summer month "*sub sarcinis*." The recruit had to learn to keep in perfect alignment with his fellows while on the march and to stay where he was put. "*Ne locum deserat*" was a first essential in a Roman soldier. He had to be taught to run, to jump both high and far, to climb embankments, and to swim. While soldiers were required to learn to leap ditches and to climb embankments they had to be careful where they practiced. For leaping over the *fossa* of his own camp

a soldier was dismissed from the army. To climb over the wall of his own camp or come through the wall into camp brought the death penalty. This provision of Roman law bears an evident relation to the story of the treatment of Remus by Romulus when he leaped lightly over the city's primitive defenses.

The new soldier had to learn to plant a stake securely and to dig a trench. Roman soldiers were famous for intrenching quickly, and in the recent war this operation again assumed an important place in the education of the soldier. Trench-digging received great prominence in the training of our training camps. It is hot work under a summer sun and brings into play muscles which in most recruits are not only underdeveloped but whose existence has never before been suspected; sore backs and blistered hands put many a soldier throughout the camps "in quarters" temporarily when the first lessons in trench-digging were begun.

Throwing the spear was given great prominence in training Roman soldiers, both because of its employment in battle and because it was considered an excellent exercise for training eye and muscle, and producing physical vigor. Stakes of the height of a man were set up. The new soldier practiced hurling at such a stake a wooden javelin of greater weight than the real javelin which he was to use later. He did this under the eye of a *campidoctor* who taught him correct form in hurling. After the cast of the javelin the future soldier unsheathed a club of twice the weight of the sword which he was to use in real warfare and carrying a wicker shield, weighted to twice the weight of the real *scutum*, running and with zig-zag leaps to terrify and confuse his enemy, he charged upon the postman. Coming near, he leaped toward him, jumped back and to either side, feinting or thrusting at head or face or ribs or slashing at calves or shins. His instructor watched every movement and pointed out wherein the attacker by incorrect form exposed himself to a return blow from his antagonist. This is almost exactly parallel to the instruction given to our soldiers in the use of the bayonet. Experienced French, English, and Canadian officers were brought to our camps to serve as *campidoctores*. The experience in bayonet instruction was so realistic that hundreds of our brave new American soldiers fainted as they transfixed or

disemboweled dummies stuffed with grass and sods. Both ancient and modern methods were meant to overcome this squeamish feeling so far as possible and to give that perfect confidence and self-control that comes from the consciousness of mastery of what one is about to do, the confidence that destroys fear. It may be noted also that the Romans taught their soldiers to thrust rather than to cut with the sword. They saw that a cut, though delivered with considerable force, was not likely to reach a vital point, for the vital parts of the body were protected both by the armor and by bones, while a thrust, though entering the body but two inches, was likely to find a vital spot. They saw also that when the right arm was raised to deliver a slashing cut, the right side beneath the uplifted arm was exposed to attack, while a thrust can be started and executed without uncovering the body of the attacker. It was this that determined the choice of the short, pointed Spanish sword by the Romans. Tacitus mentions the disadvantage under which the Caledonians labored in the battle of Mount Graupius with their great, unpointed broadswords when the Romans came close in and used the thrust stroke (*Tac. Agric.* 36). The use of the bayonet in modern warfare is an approval of the judgment of the Romans in the choice of the kind of sword and the method of its use. It should be added also that the Roman soldier was taught to parry and turn aside a coming missile or a sword-thrust by oblique strokes with his sword.

In Caesar's army certainly, and probably through most of Roman history, when an entirely new legion was formed from inexperienced recruits their first service was given them in company with some veteran legion. They were allowed a place in the battle line only after they had been prepared for it by preliminary training and by experience in light engagements. But most of the recruiting for the legion during the Empire consisted merely in adding a few troops at a time to a veteran legion to fill gaps in its ranks. New legions were comparatively rare. Such new recruits would rapidly learn their trade from the experienced troops of the legion who doubtless found it convenient to have apprentices to teach. Pledges in fraternities in American colleges can vividly picture the treatment given new recruits in the Roman army of the Empire

by the veterans who so willingly assisted in teaching the *tiro* the routine of his new business and in taming his individualistic tendencies into adjustment to the requirements of discipline for group life and action. In these composite legions the sternness of army discipline was mitigated slightly by Roman law in favor of the *tirones*. For example, overstaying a leave of absence might be pardoned *ignoranti adhuc disciplinam tironi*. To sell his corselet, shield, helmet, or sword made a soldier a deserter in the eyes of the Roman law and brought the death penalty; but this offense might be pardoned to the *tiro* by the *custos armorum* on the ground that arms had been placed in his hands before he was prepared to have them.

The supreme emphasis placed upon prompt and implicit obedience is shown by the Roman soldier's oath of enlistment. He made no pledge of loyal and faithful service to his country; he promised loyalty and implicit obedience to his commander, nothing more. Many instances of severe discipline related by the historians show us how thoroughly this was insisted upon. It is a provision of Roman law that soldiers who in war violate or fail to carry out the orders of the general shall be punished by death, even if their disobedience has resulted in an advantage to the army. It is related of a stern Roman disciplinarian that when some centurions without the knowledge of their superior officers left their post and cut to pieces a company of the enemy which they saw a chance to surprise and returned to camp with great booty, expecting commendation and reward, he caused them to be seized and ignominiously put to death, saying that it might have turned out to be an ambush and have destroyed respect for the government of Rome. Caesar (*Bell. Gall.* vii. 52. 4) found it necessary on one occasion to reprove over-enthusiastic troops with the caution, *Nec minus se in milite modestiam et continentiam quam virtutem atque animi magnitudinem desiderare.*

But the Romans never sought to make a mere unreasoning automaton of the private soldier. They required obedience that he might be used effectively by his commander; but they were careful to develop resourcefulness, initiative, and self-reliance that the soldier might use himself effectively. The spirit of their

training is here in exact accord with that of the American army as it has been expressed by students of our first training camp at Camp Plattsburg organized by Major-General Wood. The method of fighting in their battle line required initiative on the part of the private in the ranks. They sought to make those actions which are required on every battlefield as nearly automatic as they could, to the end that the soldier might have a chance to make the best possible achievement individually without failing to keep in perfect co-ordination with his fellows. Fear they would banish by well-founded confidence in his superiority over his enemy. As Vegetius says, *Huic taliter instituto tironi pugnare adversum quoslibet hostes in acie formido non erit sed voluptas.* "To the recruit trained in this way the contest in battle, no matter who the enemy, will bring not dread but joyous anticipations."

Notes

[Contributions in the form of notes or discussions should be sent to John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.]

NEPOS AND ROMAN PRAISE OF HANNIBAL

On page 265 of the *Classical Journal* for February, 1921, Mr. Louis E. Lord, of Oberlin College, writes, "In all Latin literature I know of no generous tribute to Hannibal." Evidently Mr. Lord has overlooked or has forgotten the first chapter of Nepos' life of Hannibal:

Si verum est, quod nemo dubitat, ut populus Romanus omnis gentis virtute superarit, non est infitiandum Hannibalem tanto praestitisce ceteros imperatores prudentia quanto populus Romanus antecedat fortitudine cunctas nationes. Nam quotienscumque cum eo congressus est in Italia, semper discessit superior. Quod nisi domi civium suorum invidia debilitatus esset, Romanos videtur superare potuisse. Sed multorum obtrectatio devicit unius virtutem.

CLYDE R. JEFFORDS

NEWTOWN HIGH SCHOOL
ELMHURST, LONG ISLAND

THE TEST OF THE PATRONYMICS

Wilhelm Meyer's dissertation *de Homerici Patronymicis*, Goettingen, 1907, was immediately welcomed as a work of very great importance by reviewers and critics, as I have already shown in *Classical Philology*, VII, 293.

The summary of his results was given by him as follows: "The patronymics grow rarer, not only in the later portions of the *Iliad*, but also in all parts of the *Odyssey*. From this decreasing use of the patronymics it is evident that there must have been an interval of many years between the composition of these two poems."

This dissertation was passed upon by two scholars of the standing of Schwartz and Wackernagel, as well as submitted to an *Examen rigorosum*, so that in my previous paper I accepted many of his statements as facts and tried to bring them into harmony with my own beliefs in the unity of the Homeric poems.

In my previous discussion I explained the difference in the number of the patronymics, as shown in the two poems, as due to the fact that there are so many more heroes in the *Iliad*, men of patronymic rank, while in the *Odyssey* many of the actors are mean or commonplace, hence could hardly have that honoring epithet.

The greater number in the *Iliad* was on this explanation due to the rank of the actors and not to a change in feeling or in the use of the patronymic.

Even this solution is entirely unnecessary, for the markedly decreasing use of the patronymics *in tota Odyssea* is pure fiction, as this simple test will prove.

The two books which Meyer regarded as belonging to the oldest stratum are A and X. The following men who appear in A have patronymics: Achilles, Calchas, Agamemnon, Menelaus, and Patroclus, that is, five in all. The following in X have patronymics: Achilles, Agamemnon, Menelaus, and Priam, or four in all. Of these which appear in X only one is not found in A, so that but six of the men who appear or are mentioned in these two books have patronymics. These two books have a combined length of 1,126 verses.

The book which all the critics put as the latest and worst in Homer is the last book of the *Odyssey*.

In this last book of the *Odyssey* the following men are mentioned with the honoring patronymic: Achilles, Agamemnon, Laertes, Odysseus, Patroclus, Aphidas, Halitherses, or seven in all. Hence book twenty-four of the *Odyssey* in 548 verses has one more actor who is given a patronymic than the 1,126 verses of A and X.

A test applied to the first book of the *Odyssey*, another book which the critics have regarded as late, shows that it has the following patronymics: Atreides, Agamemnonides, Mermerides, and Peisenorides, only one of which is found in the *Iliad*. This first book has in 444 verses as many patronymics as X has in 515, and two of the patronymics found in this first book appear nowhere else, while each of the patronymics found in X is repeated in many books of the *Iliad*.

One need hardly seek for satisfying reasons to meet the statement, "Ut in Iliadis recentibus partibus ita in tota Odyssea patronymicorum usus rarescere incipit," since all that is necessary is to find the examples and then to count them.

Recently I was in an engineering school in which the task was set of making a concrete arch capable of supporting a certain weight. When the arch was completed the test was at once applied and if there was any defect in construction the arch immediately collapsed. The weakness of classical instruction is that there is no ready test for measuring the thing accomplished and a person who honestly judges a dissertation is obliged not only to read it but to prepare a duplicate dissertation of his own.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Current Events

[Edited by Clarence W. Gleason, Roxbury Latin School, Boston, Mass., for the territory covered by the Association of New England and the Atlantic States; Daniel W. Lothman, East High School, Cleveland, Ohio, for the Middle States, west to the Mississippi River; Walter Miller, the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., for the Southern States; and Franklin H. Potter, the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, for the territory of the Association west of the Mississippi, exclusive of Louisiana and Texas. News from the Pacific Coast may be sent to Miss Julianne A. Roller, Franklin High School, Portland, Ore., and to Miss Bertha Green, Hollywood High School, Los Angeles, Cal. This department will present everything that is properly news—occurrences from month to month, meetings, changes in faculties, performances of various kinds, etc. All news items should be sent to the associate editors named above.]

Colorado

University of Denver.—The Classical Club recently held an open meeting, at which Professor E. D. Cressman delivered a lecture on Vergil's *Aeneid*, illustrated by stereopticon slides. The club, now in its third year, holds monthly meetings, usually at the homes of the members. The programs consist of many topics on classical life and literature which are not treated in the regular classroom work. The large increase in the number of students taking both Latin and Greek is very encouraging.

Georgia

Atlanta.—The Dramatic Club of the Girls' High School, under the direction of Miss Anabel Horn have recently dramatized, filmed, and presented "Aeneas' Descent into Avernus." The event is described by Mr. Dudley Glass in the *Atlanta Georgian* as follows:

"Aeneas' Descent into Avernus," the dramatization of the sixth book of Virgil presented on the screen by students of the Atlanta Girls' High School, is a revelation of the possibilities of the motion picture in schools and colleges. The shadowy figures of the frequently dry-as-dust textbooks become living, breathing men and women. No girl who took a part in the picture play will ever forget her Virgil, and the younger pupils who watched the adventures of Aeneas on the screen will take up the study of Latin with interest instead of dread. The amateur players were well trained, and the picture is one of exceptional beauty, dramatically and photographically.

And by Mr. Turner Jones in the *Atlanta Constitution*:

Motion pictures have long been recognized as one of the greatest social influences of modern times and today are taking their place beside Church, Press and School. The "picturization" of the sixth book of Virgil by Miss Anabel Horn, chairman of the board of Junior dramatics of the Girls' High School assisted by the English teachers of that institution, constitutes one of the first determined efforts to lift the art from the showman's plane and judiciously to guide a hitherto undirected force in society.

The pedagogical possibilities opened up by this accomplishment appear unlimited. Participation in such dramatic productions will give the impetus to study of the personal element and the presentation of the pictures before students will awaken dormant interests by the realistic rendition.

From an artistic standpoint the sixth book of Virgil is a masterpiece, combining the classical charm of the myth with nature's most beautiful settings and real dramatic ability.

Massachusetts

Boston.—The fourteenth annual meeting of the Eastern Massachusetts Section of the Classical Association of New England was held in conjunction with the Classical Club of Greater Boston at Harvard University, on Saturday, February 12, with the following program:

"A Word of Welcome," Rev. Willard Reed, President of the Classical Club of Greater Boston; "The Latin Comprehensive Examination," Mr. Earl W. Taylor, Roxbury Latin School; "An Experiment in Vocational Latin," Miss C. Carlotta Wiswall, Melrose High School; "Latin and Dressmaking," Miss Grace W. Ripley, 372 Boylston St., Boston; "Latin and Salesmanship," Miss Grace T. Blanchard, High School of Practical Arts, Boston; "Standardized Tests and the Teaching of Latin," Professor Alexander J. Inglis, Harvard University; Lantern Talk: "Excavating in the Sudan," Mr. Dows Dunham, Assistant Curator of Egyptian Art, Boston Museum of Fine Arts.

Mr. Reed in his "Word of Welcome" borrowed a happy expression from friends of the Unitarian faith, and urged each member of the club to interest persons other than teachers in the cause of the classics, to the end that a Laymen's League might be formed.

Mr. Taylor gave a detailed account of his experiences in correcting College Entrance Board Examinations, and demonstrated that full justice is given to each candidate.

Miss Wiswall reviewed the work now going on in Vocational Latin, and outlined the methods pursued in her classes in the Melrose High. It is encouraging to note that Latin is now a required study in this school for all pupils in the Secretarial Course.

A living model, clad in ancient costume, featured the address of Miss Ripley, illustrating the connection between the past and present. Miss Blanchard's strong paper demonstrated the practical value of Latin for saleswomen and salesmen.

Professor Inglis' paper was of unusual interest, and all present would gladly have listened to a longer address on the subject of the application of the principles of modern Psychology to the teaching of Greek and Latin.

There was a large and enthusiastic audience, and the meeting was one of the most successful in the history of the club, owing in no small degree to the painstaking efforts of the secretary, Mr. Clarence W. Gleason, of the Roxbury Latin School.

It is hoped to arrange for an exhibition of moving pictures on classical subjects for the next meeting, to be held on the afternoon of March 19, at the High School of Practical Arts, Winthrop and Greenville streets, Roxbury.

Ohio

Marion.—Junior and Senior girls of the Latin Department of the Marion High School (recently christened the Harding High School) have maintained "Inter Nos" organizations for eight years. Membership eligibility is based on scholarship. Every three weeks meetings are held at the girls' homes, where a social hour with refreshments follows the program.

The Junior girls in their club usually take up a study of the private life of the Romans or follow Miss Paxson's suggestions in her *Handbook for Latin Clubs*, introducing special features such as Latin songs, original stories with classical background, and parodies on the Latin authors studied in high school. At each meeting the president appoints one girl to have a surprise at their next gathering; these surprises may be in the nature of Latin puzzles or contests, or perhaps the girls may be asked to dress Roman dolls.

The Senior girls' programs consist for the most part of studies in mythology or stories from mythology. The meeting at which the subject "Was Aeneas Justified in His Treatment of Dido?" was debated and a story of "Dido Up-to-Date" was read, is usually a guest meeting.

Recently a Roman senate has been organized for the Sophomore, Junior, and Senior boys attaining the grade of "A" in Latin. Officers are consuls, praetors, quaestors, and aediles. Programs include debates and discussions on current topics. We have also introduced dramatizations of the senate scenes of which Cicero tells us in the third and fourth Catilinarian Orations.

The Latin department on February 19 presented Professor F. J. Miller's dramatization from Virgil, "Dido."

Cincinnati.—Under the auspices of the Cincinnati Classical Club, Miss Dorothea Spinney of Stratford-on-Avon, gave two very interesting readings at the University of Cincinnati on February 23 and February 25. The first of the readings was the *Alcestis* of Euripides, the second being the *Antigone* of Sophocles. Miss Spinney's charming interpretations delighted the many friends she had in Cincinnati, who were happy to welcome her once more. The readings were followed by a tea in the Woman's Building.

On Saturday, February 26, was held the Seventeenth Annual Conference of the Schools Affiliated with the University of Cincinnati. The Classical Club of Cincinnati in conjunction with the Classical Language Section of the conference brought here Professor Wm. A. Oldfather, of the University of Illinois, who read an interesting paper on "The Sayings of Jesus Recorded Outside of the New Testament," including interesting material from Egyptian papyri.

The other numbers that added to the very interesting afternoon were "The Roman School Teacher and his Reward," by Dr. Rodney Robinson, of

the University of Cincinnati, and "Traces of Greek Life in Modern Egypt," by Mr. Alfred M. Dame, formerly of Walnut Hills High School, Cincinnati, now of the faculty of Washington and Jefferson University.

Virginia

The Randolph-Macon Woman's College has had the privilege of seeing nine Greek plays during the past twelve years. It is the aim of the Greek Department to make the play an annual event; but in some years there is not enough dramatic talent in the classes to justify the undertaking. The plays indicated have been given on the following dates: the *Alcestis* in 1909, *Antigone* in 1910, *Medea* in 1911, *Oedipus Tyrannus* in 1913, *Electra* in 1914, *Antigone* in 1917, *Alcestis* in 1918, *Iphigenia in Tauris* in 1919, *Medea* in 1920. There was a second public performance of the 1910 *Antigone* in Lexington, Virginia, by invitation of Washington and Lee University. The music for the first *Alcestis* was adapted from Gluck's *Alcestis*. For the *Antigone*, Mendelssohn's well-known music was used. For the other performances the music was composed by members of the department. Since 1917 the Greek play has been one of the features of the annual celebration of the Phi Beta Kappa Society. The play chosen for presentation on the afternoon of the installation of the society was the *Antigone*. Among the spectators was Professor Shorey of the University of Chicago. His presence was an inspiration to the players, especially to "Antigone," whose Greek will always be associated with the memory of his praise of her rendering of a most difficult rôle. On Phi Beta Kappa Day of last session the *Medea* was presented. Years of experience in dealing with materials made possible a more effective costuming. The colors were selected to harmonize with the greens and tans of early spring in Virginia. The music of the 1911 performance was used and the beautiful choruses were well rendered. It was felt by the large audience that watched the play from the slopes of the natural amphitheater that such a presentation represented a distinct contribution to the intellectual atmosphere of the college.

Professor Thomas FitzHugh, who has been on leave of absence on account of his health, has returned to his work at the University of Virginia.

Dr. Walter Montgomery has been elected to the chair of Latin in William and Mary College to succeed Dr. W. A. Clark, who resigned in September.

ITALY-AMERICA SOCIETY

The Italy-America Society announces a tour to Italy for college students and instructors during the summer of 1921. The purpose of the society in organizing the trip is to give, at the lowest possible expense, the greatest possible opportunity for acquaintance not only with the art of Renaissance Italy, but also with the industry and commerce of modern Italy. It is being organized with very definite educational objects in view, for the benefit of representative young Americans who in a few years will be taking a leading part in the industrial, commercial, and intellectual life of the United States.

The party will sail on June 29 from New York direct to the Mediterranean on one of the large trans-Atlantic liners specially chartered for the occasion. On shipboard there will be classes in the Italian language and a course of lectures on Italian history, art, and culture. In Italy the party will be under the instruction of some of Italy's most distinguished scholars. A special train will be provided for the journey, and every assistance will be given by the Italian government.

The itinerary includes Gibraltar, Naples and vicinity, Rome, Florence, Bologna, Ravenna, Venice, Milan, Turin, and Paris.

The price of the tour is \$600. This includes all ocean and railway transportation, transfer and care of baggage, board and lodging at good hotels, all expenses of sight-seeing, admission to galleries and museums, carriages, automobiles, and every calculable expense connected with the tour.

Personal expenses, such as laundry, food and drink not on the regular menu, and fees to stewards on ocean steamers are not included in the price.

Baggage should be limited in the traveler's own interest. A large suitcase and possibly a handbag in addition will meet all requirements.

Sight-seeing is planned in a way to secure the best results in the time at our disposal. The party will be divided into several small groups each in charge of a leader thoroughly familiar with the subject. In so far as it is possible, each individual of the party will be given opportunity to study those things which are of particular interest. The time allotted is sufficient for seeing everything of importance in each place.

Responsibility. The American Express Company acts only as agent and accepts no responsibility in connection with the service of any steamer, train, automobile, or other conveyance which is used in the execution of this tour, and it assumes no responsibility for delay, accident, or loss to personal property or baggage or for additional expense due to war, storm, epidemic, delay, or any casualty beyond its control.

Membership may be secured by paying a deposit of sixty dollars (\$60). Money, with application for membership, properly filled out, should be sent to Irwin Smith, manager, Italy-America Society, 23 West 43d Street, New York City.

American Express travelers' checks are the universally spendable travel funds, safe, convenient, and reasonable in price. Carry them to Italy with you this summer.

For further information write to A. F. Pierce, Jr., Travel Department, American Express Company, 65 Broadway, New York City.

DANTE'S SEXCENTENARY

The sixth centenary of the death of Dante Alighieri will be celebrated at Ravenna, September 14, 1921. For several years preparations have been making in Italy to lend to the event a splendor commensurate with the influence

of Dante on modern thought. It is proposed, in particular, to restore to its original beauty the church of San Francesco, in which for six hundred years Ravenna has guarded with jealous love the remains of the great poet. The world-war has of course interfered with the plans of Italy's foremost scholars but their ardor has not been cooled, and already from various parts of war-scarred and depressed Europe are coming assurances of hearty co-operation in the various features of the approaching event.

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

At its recent annual meeting the Association accepted an invitation from the Classical Association of Great Britain to join with that Association in an Anglo-American General Meeting at Cambridge, England, August 2-5, 1921.

The meeting will open with a reception on the evening of August 2 (Tuesday). Wednesday morning Dr. Walter Leaf, president of the Association of Great Britain, will deliver the usual annual address; Wednesday evening there will be a meeting at the Archaeological Museum; Thursday evening, a Greek play; Friday evening, a farewell reception. The afternoons will be largely spent in visiting the colleges of the University and in an excursion to Ely. The reading of papers will take place mainly in the morning.

THE ASSOCIATION GUILLAUME BUDÉ

At a time when France is working and reconstructing in all fields of activity, it is believed that the effort which she is successfully making in the science of philology and in the higher fields of literature cannot fail to interest her friends in America and all who are interested in the intellectual and moral progress of humanity.

During the war, an association which comprises all the great French philologues was founded under the presidency of Maurice Croiset, member of the Institute and Administrator of the Collège de France. This association chose as its patron the greatest humanist of the French Renaissance, the founder of the Collège de France, Guillaume Budé. Its purpose is to publish collections of Greek and Latin authors, historical documents and literary studies, and commentaries relating to Greek and Roman antiquity. In addition, it seeks to establish and to maintain bonds of solidarity between all those who are interested in Graeco-Latin culture.

Its first undertaking is the "Collection of the Universities of France," which comprises the principal works of Greek and Latin antiquity. Of each work there will be published an original text with a translation on the opposite page, a volume containing the text by itself, and a volume containing the translation only. In addition to the main collection, the Association Guillaume Budé will bring out a "Collection of Ancient Studies," the first volume of which, a *History of Latin Christian Literature*, has already appeared.

Hints for Teachers

Edited by B. L. Ullman, University of Iowa

[The aim of this department is to furnish high-school teachers of Latin with material which will be of direct and immediate help to them in the classroom. Experience will determine what the features of the new department should be. Suggestions are welcomed.

Teachers are requested to send questions about their teaching problems to B. L. Ullman, Iowa City, Iowa. Replies to such questions as appear to be of general interest will be published in this department. Others will, as far as possible, be answered by mail. Teachers are also asked to send to the same address short paragraphs dealing with teaching devices, methods, and materials which they have found helpful. These will be published with due credit if they seem useful to others.]

Latin for English

Teachers should encourage their pupils to bring to class the new words they have read or heard in other classes or elsewhere. The Latin classroom should serve as a laboratory for the dissection of such words. (See Perkins in the *Classical Journal*, XII [1916], 139-40.) Probably 80 per cent of these words will be of Latin or Greek origin, as the students are already familiar with most of the simpler Teutonic words in the language. Out of 100 or more "war" words, i.e., new words that came in during the war, or old words which took on new meanings or which became common, about 80 per cent were found to be of Latin and Greek origin. The history of the war could be written around a few leading words of Latin origin, e.g., *moratorium, militarism, Kultur, submarine, morale, mandatory, bonus*. It was Coleridge who said: "There are cases in which more knowledge of more value may be conveyed by the history of a word than by the history of a campaign."

No teacher, of course, can be expected to know offhand the derivation of every English word brought to class. If she hesitates to betray her ignorance to her young pupils (the younger the pupil the more does he expect omniscience on the part of the teacher), she may have the words handed in one day and discussed the next. The laboratory method must be followed: teacher and pupil together should work out the derivation wherever possible. Here is a chance to apply one of the latest pedagogical theories. Don't send the pupils to the dictionary, or else they will cease bringing in new words!

A free copy of a little pamphlet on "English and Latin" may be obtained from the Registrar, Iowa City, Iowa, by asking for *Service Bulletin*, Vol. IV, No. 21.

Parallels

Some time ago, Dr. Evans, writing in the *Chicago Tribune*, stated that twenty-five years ago the physicians of Mississippi were busiest in the summer

and fall: "In those days they had to keep relays of horses and the doctors rarely got eight hours' continuous sleep. Up early in the morning and working until late at night, they were unable to see all of the acutely sick daily. Now they have a good deal of leisure at that season." He observes that the same thing was true in Chicago and probably throughout the country. He explains this condition as due to the great ravages of typhoid and malaria in the old days.

This reminds us that the autumn, the finest season of the year in many parts of our country, was considered the most dangerous season by the Romans. Their great scourge was malaria, which is prevalent in the autumn because the species of mosquito which, as we have learned in recent years, spreads the malaria germ, begins its work in the late summer. Juvenal speaks of *letifero autumno* and Horace says *per autumnos nocentem corporibus metuemus Austrum*. Horace sets forth the common Roman belief that the wind was responsible for the malaria. This view is preserved in the word malaria itself (*mal-aria* = "bad air").

Books on the Teaching of Latin

I have often been asked to give the names of books on the teaching of Latin. My invariable answer is that the best source for information on this subject is the *Classical Journal*, in its current numbers and in its completed volumes. A glance through the General Index for Volumes I-XIII proves this to be true. Under the general head of "Pedagogy" there are a score or more of references for "Latin Curricula," "Practical Methods in Teaching," "Direct Method," "Vocabulary," "Vocational Latin," etc. Besides these, there are many other important articles, reviews and notes bearing on teaching. Another very important periodical is the *Classical Weekly* (\$2.00 a year; Charles Knapp, 1737 Sedgwick Ave., New York City). Occasional articles of value are found in the *School Review*. *Latin Notes* was mentioned in the December "Hints."

The following books are available:

Bennett and Bristol, *The Teaching of Latin and Greek in the Secondary School*. 1900. Longmans, Green & Co. \$1.90. (The new edition, 1911, is practically the same.) This book is individual in point of view on some matters (such as pronunciation and prosody) and reactionary on others. Obviously one cannot expect to find in it a discussion of the newer developments in Latin teaching. Good summaries of the older literature on the value of Latin and the course of study, and good suggestions on oral methods, the Latin authors, etc.

Hecker, E. A., *The Teaching of Latin in Secondary Schools*. 1909. Schoenhof Book Co., 128 Tremont St., Boston. \$0.80. A badly arranged book with some good material and some not so good. Rather antiquated.

Game, J. B., *Teaching High School Latin*. 1919. University of Chicago Press. \$1.00. A good book as far as it goes.

Sabin, Frances E., *A Handbook for Latin Teachers.* (*Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin*, No. 754.) 1915. Madison, Wis. \$0.10. A useful little manual.

Johnston, C. H., *High School Education.* 1912. Scribner. Chapter on Latin by A. T. Walker (pp. 257-76, 484-97). Very brief but good.

Foreign books, such as L. W. P. Lewis' *Practical Hints on the Teaching of Latin* (Macmillan, 1919), are of little help to American teachers. This particular book, though it has the merit of being an extremely detailed exposition of classroom procedure, is entirely reactionary from the American point of view. Conditions in England are quite different.

Lists of books and other material bearing on various phases of Latin teaching will be given in these "Hints" from time to time.

Teaching Indirect Discourse

The greatest difficulty in the understanding of continuous indirect discourse as we find it in Caesar is caused by the failure of the students to understand its workings in English. Teachers who realize this fact find various ways for remedying the trouble. A little device mentioned in Lewis' book (referred to in the preceding paragraph) strikes me as worth trying. He says (p. 64): "Begin with those Indirect Statements only which are clearly reported, and start with the English. The work proceeds like this:—*Q.* 'What is an Indirect Statement?' *A.* (to be obtained) 'An Indirect Statement is a statement made by *A* to *B* and reported by *X* to *Y*.' Have some boys out in front of the class and make them act the thing, showing them first how it goes. Make *A* say to *B* 'The weather is fine,' and *X* report to *Y* in the form 'A told *B* that the weather was fine.' (Here we get a bit of the much recommended movement and action even in Latin.) Then have another set of boys out and let them arrange another example in whispers for themselves. Put a boy *A* in charge and he will arrange the parts, so to speak. He will explain what he is going to say to *B* and will instruct *X* how to report to *Y* the statement he makes. Then let them go through it for the class. I call it making a charade, and I always know when I am doing well, as if anything goes wrong in an ordinary lesson with a duller boy (the change of pronouns, for instance, is liable to give trouble, and the tense) there is sure to be a hand up at once with 'Please, sir, may I make a charade for him?' Lastly, we make our *A*, *B*, *X*, and *Y* report in all sorts of ways, so that the various reported statements begin with, 'He told him,' 'He told me,' 'I told him,' 'I told you,' 'You told me,' etc. Let there be plenty of it. The boys like it, and they soon get to grasp the pronoun changes and other points. Finally we give them the reported statement and let them get back to the original words spoken."

Book Reviews

Homeric Greek. A Book for Beginners. By CLYDE PHARR.
Boston: D. C. Heath & Company, 1921. Pp. xlii+391.

For several years we have heard of Professor Pharr's work with beginners in Greek, but up to the present time his doings have been shadowed with an agreeable mystery. With the publication of his book the secret is out and he spreads his apparatus before us.

As a matter of fact, there is nothing revolutionary about this book, which embodies Professor Pharr's ideas, aside from the choice of Homer rather than Xenophon or some other Attic prose writer, as its basis, and even this, as the author assures us (pp. xvi f.), is not new, but goes back to the Roman school-masters and to modern educators like Herbart and Ahrens. I may add to his list of instances the practice in Professor Dewey's "go-as-you-please" school at Chicago a decade or two ago, where, as a friend once told me, the pupils began their Greek with Homer and enjoyed it thoroughly. In the actual teaching Professor Pharr, I take it, has nothing new to offer, and since he subscribes at once to my own golden rule, Professor Gildersleeve's epigram, which he quotes on page vi, and believes, as I do, that the student should learn the most useful forms first, I find myself in accord with him on these fundamentals.

The book contains, after the preface and introductory essay, a chapter about Homer and his works; then seventy-seven lessons, each with grammar assignments to learn, vocabulary, prose sentences in both English and Greek for translation, and a passage from the first book of the *Iliad* varying from five lines in the first lessons to a dozen or more in the last; then a grammar of one hundred and forty-two pages, and finally Greek-English and English-Greek vocabularies. Lesson by lesson English derivatives are given, and the main vocabulary is arranged in simple alphabetical order, which after all is less confusing to young students than grouping words under their roots. In the first few lessons Homer is not quoted; the first two declensions and the first four tenses of the verb are studied, while the words soon to be seen in the *Iliad* are used as the basis of the Greek and English sentences. At Lesson XIII come *Iliad* i. 1-5, with notes, and hereafter each lesson has its Homeric passage. Throughout, Homeric forms are set for the student to learn and are used in all the exercises.

Homeric Greek is not in any sense a freak book. Its arrangement is that of most beginning books; its grammar is carefully and conservatively stated in the usual terms and is amply sufficient for the student's needs; in fact there is more than he can be expected to learn outright. Physically the book

is attractive, carefully edited, and well illustrated; the pictures, however, might be better related to the text by adequate references to them. In the matter of literary illustrations, too, Professor Pharr really might have done better than to quote the Old Testament to the almost complete exclusion of anything else. The Old Testament, of course, furnishes excellent parallels, but after all, Homer is not Semitic, and there are passages in Greek and Latin literature which illustrate him better because they are a part of his own civilization, and which also demonstrate his great influence upon others. The debt of English literature to Homer, as well, might be shown in the same way.

The use of Homeric Greek in prose sentences must perforce seem strange, but if we grant the desirability of studying Homeric Greek in the beginning course this cannot be avoided. By using "made-up" Greek sentences for supplementary drill Professor Pharr seeks a method of keeping a mastery over forms and vocabulary from day to day, but at the same time he runs counter to the principle advocated by Professor James Turney Allen in his *First Year of Greek*, a book in which there is no Greek of modern construction.

No teacher, however, need hesitate to put this book in the hands of a class; it is an honestly made text. Since its appearance is something of an event, and since its author, after signal success in arousing interest in Greek by its means, makes in his introduction bold claims for the advantages of using Homer thus, a few observations may be made on the advisability of revising our methods.

The best argument pro must remain Homer's charm and the possibility of interesting students in him. Xenophon never called forth from anyone, nor could he call forth, such lyric enthusiasm as that of Andrew Lang (quoted, pp. xxxiv ff.), and this enthusiasm, at least to some degree, the ordinary student of literary tastes can share, for Homer's merits are plain and easy to appreciate. An author read in the first year must of necessity be taken in small doses, and Homer will not lose by such treatment as much as most others (I will not say *all* others).

Furthermore, I can see some advantage in teaching first grammatical forms which are historically earlier (see p. xviii), and building the later dialects upon them, for students learn a thing more thoroughly when they know the "why" of it and something about its genetics. It is the difference between rote learning and the building up of a logical train of thought.

Contra, however, it must be asked whether Homer is too difficult for beginners, and whether it is practical to learn Homeric Greek first. Both these points Professor Pharr notices, and of course he takes Homer's side, perhaps too enthusiastically. Homeric morphology is not forbiddingly hard for beginners to learn, and certainly his syntax is much easier than that of prose. I am not, however, convinced either that the number of Homeric forms to be memorized is so much less than that of the Attic forms, or that Homer's vocabulary is not harder than that of most prose writers, and this in spite of figures. With regard to the nouns and adjectives, for example,

I note that Professor Pharr counts among the Attic forms to be learned the duals and some of the endings for the "Attic second" declension; but certainly most of us no longer think it a sin to omit or to defer these. Taking account of the irregularities, Homer will be just as puzzling as a prose writer.

I greatly regret that I lack the facilities for verifying Professor Pharr's data about vocabularies, and that I have not the time to make independent counts. The tables which he gives on page xxiii, however, to my mind prove simply that there are two vocabularies for Greek literature generally, one prose, the other poetic, and the latter is strongly influenced by Homer. Plato, Herodotus, and Plutarch, among the prose writers mentioned, veer toward the poetic, and of the poets Aristophanes and Menander show close affinity with the prose vocabulary; the latter is the only poet in Professor Pharr's list of those who have more words in common with Xenophon than with Homer. The conclusion is simply that either Homer or Xenophon is the better preparation for further reading according to what authors you plan to study, and there is fine material in either list. But this bears little upon the question of relative difficulty, and I do not think that the mere citing of $\delta\pi\alpha\xi\lambda\epsilon\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$ will decide it; they form too small a proportion of the whole vocabulary and besides we need not compare Homer with Xenophon alone, an author who has more than his share of peculiar words. What I suspect can be shown—and it is little more than suspicion based on casual observation—is that difficulty of vocabulary is closely connected with rapidity of change in subject. When Plato, for example, talks about one thing over a considerable stretch of text, as he is apt to, there must needs be a rather limited vocabulary in that particular passage. But Homer leaps from Troy to Chryse to Olympus, from peace to war, and hence will show a varied vocabulary in even a passage of limited compass. A trial count of *Iliad* i. 1-21, for example, shows thirty-nine different nouns, of which ten are used twice or more (of these five are proper names), sixteen adjectives, and twenty-four verbs; of the latter only two are more than once used. A passage which my own class has been reading, Plato's *Lysis* 207D-208B, about twenty-three Teubner lines, shows fifteen different nouns, nine adjectives, and twenty-eight verbs; four of the nouns and twelve of the verbs are used more than once, several four to six times each. Furthermore the list includes related words like $\hat{\eta}$ — $\hat{\epsilon}\phi\eta$, $\epsilon\mu\iota$ — $\hat{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$, $\hat{\epsilon}\pi\mu\theta\mu\kappa\omega$ — $\pi\mu\theta\mu\kappa\omega$, $\mu\sigma\theta\kappa\sigma$ — $\mu\sigma\theta\omega\tau\kappa\sigma$, $\hat{\eta}\nu\iota\alpha$ — $\hat{\eta}\nu\iota\omega\chi\oslash$, and the verbs are such as constantly recur in all prose. This of course is but one instance, but I think it lends color to my suspicion that Homer talks about more different things in any given passage than most prose writers, and that his vocabulary at any given point is therefore likely to be correspondingly harder.

On the matter of relative difficulty, then, I would somewhat discount Professor Pharr's enthusiastic plea for Homer, and still believe that Homer and Attic Greek are about equally hard in accidence, and that Homer is far easier in syntax, and more difficult in vocabulary, for the young student. We ought to recognize these things frankly, although they present no insuperable

obstacle to teaching Homer to beginners, for his interest, charm, and worth are enough to offset whatever may be said against him on this score, provided the project is desirable and practicable on other grounds.

The practical side of the question is, in the main, this: Is Homer a better foundation than Attic Greek for general reading? Here, too, Professor Pharr will have to temper his enthusiasm. He must recognize that the Attic dialect really did rule in the literary world from the time of the dramatists on, and that the Koine is more Attic than anything else; further, since of course the Attic is the best introduction to itself, it must also be the best introduction to the lion's share of Greek literature. (Even as an introduction to Homer it is not desppicable.) The question really is that of the indispensability of Homer in the student's reading. If we hold that he must not be allowed to miss Homer, no matter what else he reads, we have a very good reason for teaching Homer in the first year. On the other hand, it is possible to introduce our classes immediately to an almost limitless field of Attic prose and poetry through such a book as that of Professor Allen. The two paths are open, and both are worthy. We must remember, too, that the *Anabasis* is not the only alternative to Homer.

To my mind, these are the main issues when prejudices are stripped away; the decisions each must make for himself. My own feeling is that either prose, well taught, or Homer, well taught, is a satisfactory introduction to the language, and I am much interested in the possibilities of Homer as a means of attracting more to the study of Greek. Let us by all means give him a trial, if we wish; for our own sakes and for those of our classes let us always be seeking improvement and not stagnate. Professor Pharr's plan, unlike some other pedagogical innovations, involves no trick, no special aptitude, simply good teaching, with the certain advantage of a delightful author to study and in the face of disadvantages in the way of added difficulties which may after all prove mere bugaboos.

FRANK EGLESTON ROBBINS

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Q. *Horati Flacci Carminum Librum Quintum.* A Rudyardo Kipling et Carolo Graves Anglice redditum, et variorum notis adornatum ad fidem codicum mss. edidit ALUREDUS D. GODLEY. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1920. Pp. vi+34.

On first glance one would think that this "Fifth Book of the Odes of Horace" was nothing else than what it pretends to be. From the scholarly appearing Praefatio to the last translation, by an "incertae aetatis scholiasta," with the careful *apparatus criticus* at the bottom of each page, it has all the earmarks of a carefully edited text with translation. It is only upon closer examination that one discovers that the odes themselves have to do with such

subjects as jazz music, canteen work, and war-time prohibition, and that the "scholiasta" is a schoolboy who probably produced the translation as a piece of sight work.

As for the contents, the English "translations" are delightful, having caught the Horatian spirit in a modern setting very well, and the Latin is interesting, if nothing more. It would be too much like asking for a sixth act to *Hamlet* to ask that it be truly Horatian in its charm, although of course there are many echoes. In subject, for instance, v. 1 and v. 5 distinctly recall i. 1 and i. 4 respectively, while v. 8 is, in its matter, though not in its point of view, an imitation of i. 11. We also have phrase reminiscences, such as "laudans animam pro patria relictam," and "iam molesta transvolat hiems." But it is in meter that the comparison is most striking. Not content merely with employing Horace's favorite Alcaics, Asclepiadeans, and Sapphics, the authors have followed out most of his metrical experiments, such as the long Ionic verse and the trochaic strophe. Furthermore, under the guise of manuscript disagreements, in several cases, they have written the same ode in from two to four different ways, varying the meter and phraseology each time.

Consequently the book has two appeals. As a literary hoax or burlesque it is extremely amusing, while for a student of Horace it has a more scholarly interest. Moreover, it is stimulating to know that there are writers who, from sheer love of the classics, are willing and able to undertake such a piece of work, which will produce so little in the way of material return.

GEORGE DUMAS STOUT

LAKE FOREST COLLEGE

Recent Books

Foreign books in this list may be obtained from Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 West 27th St., New York City; G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-55 West 29th St., New York City; The F. C. Stechert & Co., 29-35 West 32d St., New York City.

BIEBER, MARGARETHE. *Die Denkmäler zum Theaterwesen im Altertum*. Berlin: Vereinigung wissenschaftlicher Verleger. 142 cuts; 109 plates. M. 190.

CAESAR. *Caesar's Gallic War*. Books i-iv and selections from Books v, vi, vii, with introduction, notes, and vocabulary, by Charles E. Bennett. Revised edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. Pp. xxxi+292. \$1.50.

CONWAY, R. S. *New Studies of a Great Inheritance*. Lectures on the modern worth of some ancient writers, by the Hulme professor of Latin in the University of Manchester. London: Murray. Pp. viii+241. 7s. 6d.

EURIPIDES. *Euripidean Fragments*. Emended by R. J. Walker. London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne. Pp. 52. 7s 6d.

EURIPIDES. *The Macedonian Tetralogy of Euripides*. Discussed and edited by R. J. Walker. London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne. Pp. 139. 12s 6d.

MOONEY, WILLIAM WEST. *Travel among the Ancient Romans*. Boston: Badger. Pp. 178. \$2.50.

SPRING HILL COLLEGE. *The New Yenni Latin Grammar for High Schools and Colleges*. Prepared by the committee on Latin studies of Spring Hill College, Mobile, Alabama. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. Pp. xvi+378. \$1.50.

VERGIL. *Aeneid x*. Edited with introduction, notes, and vocabulary by J. Jackson. (Oxford Junior Latin Series.) New York: Oxford University Press. \$0.90.